

1851
Letters, printed by H. E. Newman
1895
IMMORALITY

OF THE

Moral Philosopher :

BEING AN

A N S W E R

To a BOOK lately published, intitled,

The Moral PHILOSOPHER.

THE SECOND EDITION.

To which is added,

A REBUKE to the MORAL PHILOSOPHER
for the *Errors* and *Immoralities* contained in
his THIRD VOLUME.

L O N D O N.

Printed for JOHN NOON, at the *White-Hart*
near *Mercers-Chapel*, in *Cheapside*.

M D C C X L.

[Price One Shilling.]

718

IMMORALITY

March 1910

Я Д В С И А



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 57TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

1000000

11/11/11

1934-35



T H E
P R E F A C E.



AMONG all the Faults that Writers of Controversy can be guilty of, none can be worse than wilful Misrepresentations of the Doctrines and Expressions of their Adversaries, in order to ridicule them. Of this Crime the Gentleman, who calls himself, The Moral Philosopher, is more notoriously and more constantly guilty than any Writer I had ever the Unhappiness to read. If he had given the Bible but fair Quarter, such as he would reasonably expect I should give Cicero or Mahomet, and had only made use of sober Argument, I could not have allow'd myself to write any thing against him that should even seem to border upon Severity. But since he has broken through all the Rules of Truth, Decency, and Good-manners, he must bear to be told of it, and to be proved guilty. He calls Divines, in the Lump; Enthusiastic Pulpiteers, p. 88. and charges them as not talking Sense, p. 119. tho' I assure him I have heard Divines talk better and more coherent Sense extempore, than any thing he has wrote in his Book. The Book is a most tedious, immethodical, enthusiastic Jumble of Infidel Cant, false History, Misrepresentation, vain Repetitions, and Impertinence. And since the Author observed no regular Method in his Book, it is not to be expected there should be any in the Answer.

~~It is impossible his Attempt to discredit the Bible~~
~~should do any Mischief, if there were not Readers in~~
~~the World, who have as superficial a Knowledge of~~
~~the holy Scriptures as he. For the sake of such it~~
~~was thought necessary, that an Answer should be writ-~~
~~ten: And if this farther tends to improve young~~
~~Persons in their Understanding and Belief of the~~
~~Bible, and in their Obedience to the Gospel, I shall~~
~~obtain my End.~~

I assure the Philosopher, I am not one of the Sil-
 versmiths he speaks of in his Preface, who pretend
 Religion, while they mean nothing but their
 Shrines. Nor am I a Person of that Character with
 whom he is resolved not to dispute. I do not by a
 feign'd Opposition give up the main Points in De-
 bate: Nor am I one of those who will grant nothing
 at all, for fear of granting too much. I give him
 up all Persecution, Priestcraft, and human Inven-
 tions and Institutions, and defend only the real Religion
 of the Bible.

MAY 11,

1737.

THE

THE
IMMORALITY
OF THE
Moral Philosopher, &c.



THE *Moral Philosopher* tells us, in his Preface, that he is *not conscious to himself of any Malice or ill Design*. We must take his Word for this : But at the same time he must give me leave to say, that he has wrote much History by Invention, and has greatly *misrepresented* innumerable Things both in the Old and New Testament, in order to expose them to Ridicule ; knowing that without this *Infidel Craft*, he could not hope to succeed in his Attempt to undermine the Authority of the holy Scriptures. I do not *feel myself* at all hurt : But my Complaints are of his *Immorality*, in vending that as Truth, which he could not but know to be false in Fact. A List of such Palsifications detected will make it evident to every Reader, that the *Immoral Philosopher* is not to be depended on in any thing he says.

He tells us, p. 22. That *David danced naked before the Lord among the Daughters of Israel*; whereas the Text expressly says, that he was *girded with a Linen Ephod*, 2 Sam. vi. 14. *Mithal's* saying, v. 20. that he *uncover'd*

uncover'd himself, may only signify that he laid aside his *royal Robes*, and his *Majesty*, and acted a part, in dancing before the Ark, much beneath the Dignity of a King. But whatever she meant, every one will grant, that a Charge advanced by a Woman in a *Passion*, is not to be allow'd as an Evidence of a Matter of Fact. It is more probable that, like our Author, she *misrepresented* the Fact: For both she and our Author knew, that *David* had not only an *Ephod*, which was a long and upper Garment, on, but also that it was *girded* about him. It was then *Immorality* in our Philosopher not to lay this fairly before his Readers, if he would speak of it at all.

He asserts, p. 28. that *Moses directed the Jews to extend their Conquests as far as they could*, and that their *Plan of Government was contrived for the Conquest of other Nations*; whereas he knows this to be false, since *Moses* required *all* the Males to meet together at *Jerusalem* three times in every Year; which was confining them at home, and forbidding them to make foreign Conquests. *Moses* only order'd them to conquer *Canaan*, and the Cities that should oppose them, and make War upon them. This will plainly appear from the Words of the Law, to which the Author refers, *Deut. xx. 15, 16. Thus shalt thou do unto all the Cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the Cities of these Nations: But of the Cities of these People which the Lord thy God doth give thee for an Inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth.* The first and the most obvious Observation to be made on these Words is, that whatever Cities those were which were far off from the *Israelites*, they were not given them for an *Inheritance*, since they are expressly set in *Opposition* to such as were. And as those Cities as far off were not given them for an *Inheritance*, it cannot, without much Ignorance, or much Malice, be said, that hereby *Moses* directed the *Jews* to extend their Conquests as far as they could. The Truth is, the Cities spoken of as very far off from the *Inheritance* of *Israel*, were any Cities out of *Canaan*, that should, at any time, begin a Quarrel with the *Jews*, and attempt to invade, distress, or affront them. Thus the *Moabites* invaded *Israel*, but at length

Israel

Israel subdued them, *Judg.* iii. 12, 29, 30. Afterward the *Ammonites* made War against *Israel*, but *Israel* smote twenty of their *Cities*, and subdued them, *Judg.* xi. 4, 33. Afterward *Hanun* King of the *Ammonites* inhumanly affronted *David's* Ambassadors, whereupon *David* besieged and took *Rabbah* and many other of their *Cities*, 2 *Sam.* x. 4. xi. 1. xii. 29, 30, 31. That these *Cities* must be included among the *Cities* *very far off* from *Israel*, is evident, because this Character includes *all* the *Cities* that were *not* the Inheritance of *Israel*: And the Meaning of the Expression seems to be, *How far off soever they are*. Under this Character may be comprehended *Damascus*, *Babylon*, and any other *Cities* that made War upon the *Jews*. Nor let it seem strange that these *Cities* are represented to be *very far from Jerusalem*, when *Laiſh* is said to be *far from Zidon*, tho' they were not above *thirty* Miles asunder, *Judg.* xviii. 27, 28. Whereas *Rabbah* and *Kir* of *Moab* were each a *hundred* Miles from *Jerusalem*, and *Damascus* and *Babylon* much farther. It is plain upon the whole, that the *Jews* were not to extend their Conquests as far as they could, but to be *contented* with their *own Inheritance*, and to subdue only such as sought to *oppress* and *enslave* them.

He would persuade us, *p.* 106---108, that the *Lord's Supper* is not a *Church-Ordinance*, but is only to be eaten at Home; though he could not but know that *St. Paul* says, *What, have ye not Houses to eat and to drink in* [i. e. to take your own Suppers] *or despise ye the Church of God*, [i. e. the public Assembly where ye eat the Lord's Supper?] *If any Man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto Condemnation*; i. e. Eat your own Supper at home, but come together in the Church to eat the Lord's Supper, 1 *Cor.* xi. 22, 34.

In the 126th and following Pages, he ridicules the Doctrine of a *vicarious Sacrifice*, and asserts that *Sacrifices* were only a *Mule* or *Penalty*; and ventures to say *universally*, that no other *Penalty*, of what Nature or Kind soever, was ever taken off, or mitigated on the account of *Sacrifice*. Whereupon he very indecently insults *Grotius*,
and

and other learned Men, as *not thinking at all.* Where-
as the Truth is, the Unbeliever does neither read nor
think as he *should.* Formerly, when he read his Bible,
he knew, that another Penalty, even *sudden Death* in-
flicted by an immediate Judgment of God, was *taken*
off on the account of Aaron's offering Incense, and making
Atonement, Numb. xvi. 44, &c. The Lord spake unto
Moses, saying, Get you up from among this Congregation,
that I may consume them as in a Moment.— *The Plague*
was begun. Aaron put on Incense, and made an Atone-
ment, and stood between the Dead and Living, and the
Plague was stayed. And the general Office of the Levites
was to make an Atonement for the Children of Israel, that
there might be no Plague among them, Numb. viii. 19.
Confession of Sin, and Restitution, were not alone suffici-
ent to procure Pardon, and to save the Offender from
the Judgment of God; but a Sacrifice also was to be
offer'd, as we read, Lev. vi. 5, 6, 7. The Man that
stole or detained what was his Neighbour's, shall (says
the Law) *restore it in the Principal, and shall add the*
fifth Part more thereto, --- and he shall bring his Trespass-
offering --- to the Priest, and the Priest shall make an
Atonement for him before the Lord, and it shall be for-
given him; i. e. the Penalty of the divine Judgment
shall be taken off on the account of Sacrifice. The
Reader may see this farther confirmed, if he will turn
to Lev. iv. 14, 20, 26, 31, 35. v. 5, 6, 10, 13, 16.
xvi. 15, 30. xix. 22. Numb. xv. 25, 26, 28. There
were some Defilements among the Jews, which ren-
der'd them unfit for the Service of God in the Taber-
nacle and Temple: A Sacrifice made Atonement for
them. And so the Penalty of Banishment from God's
House and Presence was *taken off upon the account of*
Sacrifice, Lev. xiii. 46. 2 Chron. xxvi. 21. Lev. xiv,
20. The superficial Philosopher did not consider, that
the Law *curst* every one that did not continue in all
Things which were written in the Law to do them,
Deut. xxvii. 26. Gal. iii. 10. The Law determin'd,
that the Man who did not humble himself, and the Man
who did any Work on the Great Day of Atonement,
should

should be cut off: *I (saith God) will destroy him from among his People, Lev. xxiii. 29, 30.* In order to be saved from this Destruction, a Sacrifice was to be offer'd to make Atonement for the People, to cleanse them, that they might be clean from all their Sins before the Lord, and so might not be cut off by his Judgment, xvi. 30. Numb. xxix. 8. Again we read, *Whosoever toucheth the dead Body of any Man that is dead, and purifieth not himself, defileth the Tabernacle of the Lord; and that Soul shall be cut off from Israel: because the Water of Separation was not sprinkled upon him, he shall be unclean; his Uncleanness is yet upon him, Numo. xix. 13, 20.* So that the dreadful Penalty of being cut off by the Hand of God was taken off by the legal Ceremonies of Purification.

He proceeds to assert, p. 129. that *tho' human Sacrifices were not exacted by Law, among the Jews, yet they were encouraged and indulged.* And yet, in direct Contradiction to himself, he cites *Lev. xxvii. 29.* as a plain Law exacting human Sacrifices, and as a Statute fully exemplified in the Case of *Jephtha's Daughter*, p. 131. The Words of the Statute refer'd to are, *None devoted, which shall be devoted of Men, shall be redeemed, but shall surely be put to death.* The Text does not say one Word of a Sacrifice, but only of putting a Man to death; and the Person who was to be put to death, was a Man devoted. The Philosopher says, that this being devoted was being separate from the common Use. But for this he produces no Proof. Nay, it is very certain, from the Use of the Hebrew Word, *Cherem*, in other Places, that it signifies a Man's being devoted to Destruction. Thus, *Exod. xxii. 20.* *He that sacrificeth to any God, save unto Jehovah only, he shall be made a Cherem, be utterly destroyed.* See also *Deut. ii. 34. iii. 6.* It is farther order'd, that if a Jewish City fell off to Idolatry, the People should smite that City with the Edge of the Sword, making it a *Cherem*, i. e. destroying it utterly, *Deut. xiii. 12--15.* Again; it was commanded, with regard to the seven wicked Nations of Canaan, *Thou shalt smite them, and make them a Cherem, i. e. utterly destroy*

destroy them, Deut. vii. 2. Accordingly Israel vowed a Vow unto the Lord, and said, If thou wilt indeed deliver this People into my Hand, then I will utterly destroy their Cities, or make them a *Cherem*; and they utterly destroy'd (or made a *Cherem* of) them and their Cities, Numb. xxi. 2, 3. These things sufficiently explain the Statute above mentioned. When Men had devoted an idolatrous Person, an idolatrous City among the Jews, or the idolatrous Nations of Canaan to Destruction, they were not to be redeem'd, but put to death. Saul disobeyed this Precept when he spared Agag, and Abab when he spared Benbadad, 1 Sam. xv. 9. 1 Kings xx. 42. In this latter Text God calls Benbadad, *A Man whom I appointed to utter Destruction*; in Hebrew *My Cherem*. When therefore God had appointed such Enemies to Destruction, and God's People had vowed to him that they would destroy them, they were not to be redeemed, but to be put to death. And as God's People vow'd to God that they would destroy his idolatrous Enemies, these Enemies might properly be said to be made a *Cherem* to God, Lev. xxvii. 28. i. e. They were given up to him as their offended Sovereign, to be punished according to his Direction: But here is not so much as the Appearance of a Sacrifice in the Case.

He adds, p. 133. that the Case of Abraham's Readiness to offer Isaac, is a Proof of the general Opinion of that time, that human Sacrifices might be accepted of God. But how is this single Instance a Proof of a general Opinion? Take the whole Story as Moses relates it, and then it will appear, that Abraham was not in the least influenced by any generally-received Opinion at that Time, but by an immediate Direction from Heaven, as the Philosopher well knew. Here was nothing that implied, that the Blood of Man, for the Expiation of Sin, was much more efficacious than the Blood of Beasts; for God did not order that Isaac should be made a Sacrifice of Atonement, but only commanded Abraham to offer him for a Burnt-offering, which he might be, without making Atonement for any one: For Burnt-offerings

offerings were frequently offer'd as mere Testimonials of *Gratitude* and *Thankfulness* to God, without any view to expiate Sin ; as we see, *Exod.* xviii. 9---12. *1 Sam.* vi. 13, 14. But in the Case of *Abraham*, the Burnt-offering was *order'd* merely as a *Trial* of *Abraham's* Obedience, or to try whether he did truly *fear God*, *Gen.* xxii. 1, 12. It was *not intended* that this Order should be obeyed ; but it was, from the *first*, resolved that the Order should in season be *revoked* and countermanded, as in Fact it was. From whence it appears, that, by giving the first Order, God did not *dissolve the Law of Nature*, as this Philosopher weakly imagines. Nay, even if God had intended the Order should stand, and had insisted upon *Abraham's* executing it, still here would not have been so much as the *Appearance* of a Dissolution of the Law of Nature. If the Philosopher thinks the Law of Nature consists of several distinct Rules express'd in Words, like the Ten Commandments, he has not yet learnt Philosophy as he ought. The one and only Law of Nature is, *Do that which is best or fittest, all Cases and Consequences consider'd*. This Law forbids me to murder, and commands a Magistrate to put a Murderer to death. This one Law forbid *Abraham* to kill his Son, without receiving special Authority to do it ; and this same immutable Law obliged him to offer up his Son, when he received Authority and Direction from Heaven to do it. And that the great Creator and Lord of all had a Right to give such Authority and Direction is evident, because he had an unquestionable Right to take away *Isaac's* Life by Lightning, by a Fever, or by any other natural Means. For the same Reason he could not but have a Right to imploy *Abraham* as the *Instrument* of putting *Isaac* to death. Nor does this History give the least Encouragement to the Sin of *Murder*, since *Abraham's* sacrificing his Son in *consequence* of an express *divine* Command, cannot in Reason, nor even in the Opinion of the most careless Thinker, warrant another Person's sacrificing his Child *without* such an express Command.

He goes on to assert, p. 137. that the *Reservation of all the First-born of Israel, as holy to the Lord, was a Declaration of God's Right to them as Sacrifices to atone for the Sins of the People.* But this happens to be false in Fact. The Philosopher here forgot Morality, and invented this Story out of his own Head. The *First-born of Israel* were indeed *holy to the Lord*; but the Unbeliever knows they are never once spoken of as *Atoning Sacrifices* for the Sins of others. They were the *Lord's* in the same Sense in which the *Levites* were afterwards so, as is evident, because the *Levites* were chosen in their stead, *Numb. iii. 40, 41, &c.* But the *Levites* were not chosen to be *sacrificed*, but to *offer* Sacrifices to God. It is easy to give an Answer to what he takes to be a *stuning* Question, p. 139. *viz. Whether the Redemption of the First-born was a Redemption from Death and Slavery, or from Prosperity and Happiness?* The Truth is, it was from neither. It was a *Redemption* from the *laborious Services* of the Tabernacle, which the *eldest Sons* of all the Families in *Israel* must have undertaken, if the Tribe of *Levi* had not been substituted in their room. And *Gentlemen* perhaps would have thought, that killing and offering the Sacrifices was fiter for *Butchers*, and bearing the Tabernacle on their Shoulders fiter for *Porters* than for *Gentlemen's eldest Sons*. And our Author himself thinks it *below the Dignity of Princes and great Men* even to be the *Presidents* of those that were to offer the Sacrifices, p. 238.

He writes more History by Invention, p. 231, 232. where he tells a long Story about the *Occasion* of the Fall of the *Angels*, without so much as pretending to have any Evidence to support it. He confidently says, The *Occasion* was, that *Lucifer* and *Satan* would not admit that the *lower Orders* of *Angels* should present their *Addresses* immediately to God, but insisted on it, that the *lower Orders* should bring their *Addresses* to *Lucifer* and *Satan*, and that then these should present them to God. And this is merely our Author's own *Dream*, yet he delivers it with the very same Air of Truth

Truth and Certainty, as if he himself had been one of those Worshipers of Satan.

He asserts, p. 272. that the Oracle among the *Jews* was nothing but the *High-priest's giving his Answer, when clothed in his Pontificalibus*. This again he must know to be false in Fact, unless he will plead that he is (as it is plain he is) a very *superficial Reader*. *Moses* had his Answers *immediately* from the Oracle, from the *Shekinah*, from the Cloud of Glory on the Mercy-Seat, *Exod. xxv. 22. xxx. 6. Numb. vii. 89. Samuel* had his Answers immediately from the Oracle, *1 Sam. iii. 3, 4. David* received Answers not from the High-priest, but *immediately* from the Oracle, *1 Sam. xxx. 7, 8. The High-priest* was not present at that time : For *Abiathar*, who was there, was not the High-priest of that Name, but a Son of *Abimelech* of *Nob*.

He pretends the Oracle, *Judg. xx. 23, 28. was neither infallible nor impeccable* : But the Truth of the Case he has disguised and misrepresented. The real Fact was this : Certain Men in *Gibeab* of *Benjamin* had been guilty of a barbarous Murder, and horrid Adultery, upon a *Levite's* Concubine. He could have no Satisfaction there ; wherefore he made his Appeal to the other eleven Tribes of *Israel*. The eleven Tribes sent Messengers to the Tribe of *Benjamin*, to desire them to deliver up the Murderers, that they might be put to death, as they deserved. But the Children of *Benjamin* would not hearken to the Voice of their Brethren the Children of *Israel*. Nay, the Children of *Benjamin* were so far from doing Justice, that they immediately rendezvoused at *Gibeab*, to defend the Murderers. Upon this the *Israelites* were obliged to arm, and attack the *Benjamites*, that they might force them to do Justice. Then the *Israelites* went up to the House of God, and asked Counsel of him, which of the eleven Tribes should go up first to Battle against the Children of *Benjamin* ? And the Lord said, *Judab shall go up first*. In this first Battle the eleven Tribes were beaten. But the Oracle was not answerable for the Defeat, as it had ~~not~~ promised them Success, but only directed which
Tribe

Tribe should go up first. Before the second Battle, the *Israelites* asked another Question, *viz. Shall I go up again to Battle against the Children of Benjamin my Brother ?* And the Lord said, *Go up against him, v. 23.* Accordingly the *Israelites* engaged with the Tribe of *Benjamin*, and *Benjamin* again succeeded : And yet still the Oracle might be *infallible* : For the Oracle did *not* promise Success, but only gave the *Israelites* Leave to go up to Battle against *Benjamin*. Then the *Israelites* again inquired of the Lord, saying, *Shall I yet again go out to Battle against the Children of Benjamin my Brother, or shall I cease ?* And the Lord said, *Go up ; for to-morrow I will deliver them into thine Hand, v. 27, 28.* Here Victory was promised to the *Israelites* ; and accordingly they obtain'd it. When the *Israelites* had no Victory, the Oracle had not promised it : But as soon as the Oracle had promised Victory to the *Israelites*, they immediately obtained it. From this plain Account of Facts, it is evident the Philosopher exceeded the Bounds of Truth, when he would infer from this History, that the Oracle was *not infallible*. He is as obviously wrong in saying, it was *not impeccable*. For the Oracle here neither required, nor encouraged any *Immorality*. If our Author is really a *Moral Philosopher*, as he pretends to be, he must know, that the Persons who were immediately concerned in *debauching* and *murdering* the *Levite's* Concubine, ought to have been punished with *Death*. Consequently the Magistrates and People of *Gibeah* ought to have delivered them up to *Justice*. But since they would neither punish them themselves, nor deliver them up to the eleven Tribes, but would *screen* and *shelter* them, the Magistrates and People of *Gibeah* must be all deem'd *Murderers*, and worthy of *Death*. And when the whole Tribe of *Benjamin* espoused their Cause, and undertook to protect the *Murderers* against the Execution of *Justice*, all the Tribe of *Benjamin* made themselves *Parties* in the Sin, and answerable for the Murder. On this Account God did, by his Oracle, encourage the other eleven Tribes of *Israel* to punish the *Benjamites* ; and his Pro-
vidence

vidence in the end gave them Success. See now the *Immorality* of our Philosopher. He says, p. 273. *The Oracle doom'd the whole Tribe of Benjamin to Destruction, without the least Truth, natural Honour, or common Justice.* So that, according to his Philosophy, it is *contrary* to common *Justice* to punish *Murderers*, and those that *screen* and *defend* them. He owns it to be *true*, that the Men of *Gibeab* did murder the Woman, and that the *Benjamites* did not deliver up the Murderers; and yet he says, the *Benjamites* were punished *without the least Truth.* He says indeed, *the Benjamites refused to deliver up any of their Citizens, as nothing could be charged on any particular Persons,* p. 277. But to use his own Language, This is asserted *without the least Truth.* The People of *Gibeab* could no doubt have found out the *particular Persons*, if they would have heartily set themselves to discover them. But the Text tells us, that when the *Israelites* desired the *Benjamites* to deliver up the Murderers, the *Benjamites* would not bearken to the Voice of their Brethren, v. 13. They did not plead, that they did not know the particular Persons; but their Answer implies, that they *knew* them, and yet were *resolved* to *screen* and *defend* them. The Attempt of the *Israelites* to punish the *Benjamites* was the more just and necessary, because the *publick Protection* of Adulterers and Murderers would have exposed *all Israel* to the righteous and dreadful Judgments of God. This the *Israelites* plainly hinted at, when they said, *Deliver the Men, the Children of Belial, that are in Gibeab, that we may put them to death, and put away Evil from Israel,* v. 13. And since the Providence of God permitted the *Israelites* to be defeated in the two first Battles with the *Benjamites*, he knew, without Question, that they *deserved* this Punishment; and intended thereby to humble them for their Idolatry and other Sins. Thus it appears, that the Oracle, among the *Jews*, might, notwithstanding this Story, be, as indeed it was, both *infallible* and *impeccable.*

Our

Our Philosopher grossly *falsifies*, when he says, p. 289, 290, that the *Jewish Prophets were not particular as to Time, Place, Person, &c. and foretold nothing but what was imminent, and which every Man, with Eyes in his Head, must have foreseen as unavoidable.* For *Jeremiah* not only foretold the *Babylonish Captivity*, but was also so particular as to say, that it should last for *seventy Years*, and that then *Babylon* and her *King* should be destroyed, *Jer. xxv. 12, 13. xxix. 10.* *Isaiab* foretold *Cyrus* by Name, above two hundred Years before he was born, *Isai. xlv. 28. xlv. 1.* This, I should think, was more than what every Man must have foreseen as unavoidable. *Elijah* was very particular as to Place, and Person, when he foretold, that the Dogs should lick *Abab's Blood* in the same Place where Dogs had licked *Naboth's*, *1 Kings xxi. 19. xxii. 38.* *Elisha* in a Time of Famine was very particular as to the very Hour, when Plenty would come. *To-morrow* (says he) about this time shall a Measure of fine Flour be sold for a *Shekel*, and two Measures of Barley for a *Shekel* in the Gate of *Samaria*, *2 Kings vii. 1. i. e.* Flour should be about two Shillings, and Barley be about one Shilling a Peck. And yet the Nobleman, on whose Hand the King lean'd, and whose Death *Elisha* foretold, was so far from foreseeing this as unavoidable, that he declared it was incredible. I might mention many other Instances, but for Brevity's sake I omit them.

He again writes false History, when he says, p. 294. that *Saul deposed Samuel from the High-priesthood*: For *Samuel* was never High-priest, was not of the Family of the High-priest, and never usurped the High-priesthood.

He contends, p. 354. that no Christian Jew ever believed in *Jesus* as the common Savior of the World, without Distinction between Jew and Gentile. This was *St. Paul's Gospel*. He adds, p. 364. that *John* and *Peter* were two of these Christian Jews. And yet he knew, at the same time, that *John* said, *God so loved the World, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting Life; that*
he

he is the Propitiation for our Sins, [i. e. for the Sins of the Jews] and not for ours only, but also for the Sins of the whole World, John iii. 16. 1 John ii. 2. And that Peter's Doctrine was, In every Nation he that feareth God, and worketh Righteousness, is accepted with him; and, Whosoever believeth in Christ, shall receive Remission of Sins, Acts x. 34, 43. St. Peter wrote his Epistles to Gentile-Christians, and therein tells them, that they were sprinkled with the Blood of Christ, 1 Peter i. 2. St. Paul once saw Occasion to reprove Peter for dissembling a little on this Head, Gal. ii. 12. Before (said he) that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: But when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them who were of the Circumcision. From this very Account of Peter's Dissimulation it is manifest, that he did believe in Jesus as the common Savior of the World; otherwise he would not have eaten with the Gentile-Believers as Fellow Christians. And when he withdrew from them, it was not owing to any Apprehension he had, that Jesus was not their Savior, but merely to his being afraid of Jewish Christians. And even those Jewish Christians, of whose Anger he was afraid, believed that Christ was the Savior of both Jews and Gentiles. The thing wherein they differ'd from St. Paul was, that they thought the Gentiles must be circumcised in order to have an Interest in Christ: Whereas St. Paul's Gospel, and St. John's and St. Peter's too, was, that the Gentiles might be saved by Christ without Circumcision.

The Philosopher has so inured himself to falsifying, that he does not stick to assert, that St. John's Revelation establishes that Popish Doctrine, *that the ministring Angels were Mediators between God and us, and they offer'd up our Prayers at the Throne of God, p. 365. To prove this he tells us, that the twenty-four Elders, or principal Angels, which stood before the Throne, are represented as having golden Censers in their Hands full of Incense, which is the Prayers of the Saints, Rev. v. 8. It is really astonishing how any Man that has Eyes in his*

C

Head,

Head, and that makes the least Pretence to *Morality*, could venture to say, that the twenty-four *Elders* are principal *Angels*. For in the very next Verse, St. *John* says the twenty-four *Elders* were *redeemed to God, by the Blood of Christ out of every Kindred, and Tongue, and People, and Nation*. And in the 11th Verse the Apostle expressly *distinguishes* the *Angels* from the twenty-four *Elders*, and says, that the *Angels stood round about the Elders*. See also *Rev. vii. 11*. The twenty-four *Elders* then were *not Angels*, but *Saints*, redeemed out of every *People and Nation*. So that the *Prayers* of the *Saints* were offer'd, not by *Angels*, but by the *Saints themselves*. With these *Prayers* offer'd by the *Saints themselves*, an *Angel* indeed mingled his *Incense*, *Rev. viii. 3, 4*. but he did not offer the *Prayers*.

He charges St. *John* as offering *immediate direct Adoration* to an *Angel*, p. 366. The Place he refers to is, *Rev. xxii. 8*. *When I (saith St. John) had heard and seen, I fell down to worship before the Feet of the Angel, who shewed me these Things*. The only Meaning of which is, 'I was going, in a *humble Manner*, according to the Custom of the Country, to give him *Thanks* 'for shewing them to me'. The Custom of *falling at the Feet* of such as Men greatly *reverenced* may be seen, *1 Sam. xxv. 21*. *2 Kings iv. 37*. *Mat. xviii. 29*. *Acts x. 25*. and in some other Places of Scripture. And our Author knows, if he ever did study the Scriptures, that the Word, *Worship*, therein frequently means no more than such *Respect* as it was allowable for one Man to pay to another, as *1 Chron. xxix. 20*. *Luke xiv. 10*. *Rev. iii. 9*. This Account of the Matter perfectly well agrees with the Answer which the *Angel* gave to St. *John*, *See thou do it not, for I am thy Fellow-Servant, and the Fellow-Servant of thy Brethren : Worship God*. The Meaning of which is plainly this: The *Angel* rightly considered himself as a mere *Servant* in the *Affair*; on which Account no *Thanks* were due to him. The *Angel* is more absolutely the Property, and under the Government, of God, than a *Slave* is his Master's. As then no *Thanks* are due to a *Slave* who brings me a Present

sent from his Master, whom he must *obey* in bringing me the Present, whether he is *willing* to bring it or not : So no *Thanks* could be due to the *Angel* on the Account of his bringing a Message to the Apostle ; because he was *obliged* to bring it in Obedience to the Command of God, whether he was *willing* or not. All the Thanks were, in this Case, due to *God*. Thus St. *John* stands clear of the malicious Charge of paying *Adoration* to the Angel. And it is not a Matter to be much wondered at, that even a *good* Man, in a Fit of *Gratitude*, overcome with a Sense of the great Favour that was done him, should offer to give Thanks to a *Messenger* of an Order of Beings *superior* to himself ; tho' the Thanks were not really due to him, but only to the Person who sent him.

To prove that St. *John* in the *Revelation* teaches the *Invocation* of Saints (p. 366.) He quotes *Rev. vi. 9, 10.* where the Souls under the Altar say, *How long, Lord, holy and true, dost thou not avenge our Blood on them that dwell upon the Earth !* Our wise Philosopher says, that here the Martyrs *pray for us* : Tho' he knew at the same Time, that this is no Prayer *for us*, but only for *Vengeance* on their *Enemies*. He adds, *We ought to pray for them, as they do for us, and even pray to them, whenever we apprehend them present* : But forasmuch as he *knows*, that this Text does *not* represent them as praying *for us*, and that we have no manner of Reason to think them *present*, he *knows*, he had no Foundation to say, that we ought to pray *for* them, and *to* them. So that this Author egregiously *falsifies*, when he says, p. 372. that the *Worship of Saints and Angels and Prayers for the Dead are founded in the Revelation of St. John*.

He *falsifies* again in the same Page, when he saith, that St. *John*, in his *Revelation*, *confines Salvation to the Jews only ; that none are marked, and enter'd into the Book of Life, but Jews, only twelve Thousand out of each Tribe ; and that these are gathered out of every Kindred, Tongue, and Nation ; but not one Gentile was to be saved*. Whereas our Author *knew* this to be false. For St.

John says there were twelve Thousand mark'd out of each Tribe, that is, 144000 in all : And then he adds, *After this* (and consequently he speaks of *other Persons* over and above the 144000) *I beheld and lo a great Multitude, which no Man could number, of all Nations and Kindreds, and People, and Tongues stood before the Throne of God*, Rev. vii. 9. I am very sorry our Philosopher is such a Stranger to Mathematics, as to think, that 144000 is a Number, which no Man could number and that People of *all Nations and Kindreds* are only the People of one *little Nation, Judea*, and of only *one Kindred*, the Posterity of *Jacob*. The 144000 were *Jews* to be saved ; and the *great Number* which no Man could number, who came on *afterwards*, were *Gentiles* to be saved. Their being saved is fully enough signified by St. *John's* saying, that they *stood before the Throne of God, and before the Lamb, clothed with white Robes, and Palms in their Hands ; that they cried with a loud Voice, saying, Salvation to our God who sitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb ; that they had washed their Robes, and made them white in the Blood of the Lamb ; that they serve God Day and Night in his Temple ; that God shall dwell among them, and wipe away all Tears from their Eyes, &c. v. 9, 10, 13---17.*

Our Philosopher would fain persuade us, that because *Christians themselves could never agree about the Sense of their own Revelation, and because Mistakes herein may be unavoidable, therefore none of the Doctrines of Revelation can be necessary*, p. 16, 17. Where as the Truth is, that Mistakes about the *fundamental Doctrines of Christianity* are *not* unavoidable. And tho' Christians do not agree about the Sense of every Passage in the Bible ; yet they agree about the Sense of the most material and important. The Fundamentals of our Religion are, that there is *one God, and one Mediator*, or that *Jesus Christ is a true Prophet and Teacher sent from God*. Whosoever sincerely believes this, is a *Christian*. In consequence of this, he must necessarily believe every thing which *he can find* Christ has taught, and obey every Command, which *he thinks* Christ has enjoined upon

upon him. What he has therefore to do is *impartially* to examine what Christ has taught and required. He must judge and determine this for himself. *After such Inquiry*, says the Philosopher, p. 18. *Men of different Capacity must needs think differently, or understand the same verbal Propositions in different Senses.* What if they do? This will not prove, that the same Propositions have different Senses. Still the Christian Doctrines consist in the *real Sense* of the Revelation; and that Sense is but *one*: And in all *necessary* Points every *sincere* Inquirer shall be guided into that one, true Sense. And then it is not strange, that God should revele this Religion *as of necessity to Mankind.* This Religion is but one, and some Men's mistaking the Sense of some Parts of the Revelation does not make a *New Religion*, as this Author fancies, any more than a Lawyer's mistaking the Sense of 5 or 6 Statutes makes a New Statute-Book. Those Christians that differ are still of the *same Religion*, because they take the *same Jesus* for their *Master*, and are agreed in most Points, both of Doctrine and Practice, which have been taught by him; such as the Being and Attributes of God, and the Authority of Christ, his Death, Resurrection, &c. the Duties of Love to God, to Christ, to Men, Fear of God, Justice, Truth, Sobriety, and the like. These Things, wherein all Christians are agreed, are many more than those wherein they differ. And notwithstanding their Differences, Christianity is, like the Law of Nature, in itself, one invariable Thing: And it is the Author's Duty impartially to examine what it really is, that how much soever others are mistaken, he may come to the Knowledge of the Truth.

When our Philosopher pour'd out all this *Cant* against Revelation, he did not consider, that all of it may be as well applied to the *Law of Nature*, for which he pretends to be an Advocate. He will own, I suppose, that *Natural Religion* is *necessary* to Mankind. And yet he knows that the Doctrines and Rules of *Natural Religion* have been as *differently* understood and represented as those of the Gospel. Some have
repre-

represented Natural Religion as teaching the Being and Worship of *One* God only ; others of *many*. Many of the Heathens, who have been dignified with the Name of *Philosophers*, taught the *Lawfulness* of such Practices as other Men think to be *condemned* by the Religion of Nature. Is there therefore no such Thing as *Natural Religion* ? Men's Mistakes do not alter the Nature of Religion either natural or revealed : They are alike, in being each fix'd and determinate in themselves : and, notwithstanding Men's Mistakes about them, may be equally necessary to Mankind.

Our Author thinks he asks a knotty Question, *p. 32. viz. What Distinction there could be under the Mosaic Theocracy between Religion and Civil Law?* and then makes his Adversary give an *impertinent* Answer. My Answer to his Question shall be delivered mostly in his own Words, *p. 39.* ' The Ceremonial and Moral ' Laws of *Moses* being equally the Laws of God, the ' People were equally obliged to comply with each in ' point of Religion, Conscience, or Obedience to God. ' Men's observing the ritual Part of the Law could not ' intitle them to the Favour of God without real Vir- ' tue ; neither could natural Duties give them any such ' Right, under that Dispensation, without a religious ' Regard to the Law of Ceremonies : Both together ' were necessary as being the Law of the same God'. There is then no Occasion to make a Distinction between Religion and Civil Law among the *Jews* : For their Civil and Ceremonial Law were part of their Religion. This I readily grant our Author, and leave him to make what Advantage he can of the Concession. It is a plain and certain Truth, and no manner of Objection lies against it.

The Philosopher next ventures to say, that *St. Paul preached a new Doctrine contrary to Moses and the Prophets ; and that there is not one End, Use, or Purpose of the ritual Law, as declared by Moses, but what is as directly contradicted and denied by this Apostle, p. 41.* To prove this he says, that *Moses deliver'd the whole Law as an everlasting Constitution, or intended to last to the*
End

End of the World: Whereas St. Paul declares it to have been only an occasional, temporary thing, intended only to last for a few Ages. It is true, that St. Paul says: *The Law was added to the Abrahamic Covenant, because of Transgressions, till the Seed should come to whom the Abrahamic Promise was made*; that *the Law was our School-master to bring us to Christ*; and that *after Faith is come, we are no longer under a School-master but are redeemed from under the Law, and are deliver'd from the Law*, Gal. iii. 19, 24, 25. iv. 5. Rom. vii. 6. In saying these Things, St. Paul does not in the least contradict Moses; For Moses himself never thought, said, or intended to say, that his Law was to oblige the Church of God after the Coming of the Messiah, and the Calling of the Gentiles. He does not once say, that his Law was to continue for ever. He says indeed of particular Statutes, *This is a Statute for ever, This is an everlasting Statute*. And this is said in Opposition to those Statutes which were only occasional, as the Statutes relating to the Israelites marching and incamping in the Wilderness, the Levites Management of the Tabernacle (which was laid aside when Solomon built the Temple) and the like. The other Statutes which were to be observed in Canaan, and in the Temple, were called perpetual or everlasting, because they were not to cease while the Jews were God's peculiar People, but to continue in Force for ever, i. e. till the time that they should cease as a Nation to be God's People, till the Messiah should come, and bring in the believing Gentiles, together with the Believers from among the Jews, to be the People of God. And it was proper to use the Phrase *for ever*, in this Case, because the Time was to them uncertain. And, as it happens, our Philosopher himself, in another Place, thus explains the Phrase, p. 51. where he says, *Moses gave his Law as a perpetual standing Ordinance, or as long as they should continue a distinct separate People*. But after the Calling of the Gentiles, they were not to be a distinct People, but to make one People, by Faith, with the converted Gentiles. Thus our Author has well confuted himself.

He

He adds, p. 41. *Moses* declares, that by the Blood of Beasts the Offense is forgiven; while *St. Paul* says, It is impossible for the Blood of Bulls and of Goats to take away Sin. But the Moral Philosopher (notwithstanding all his indecent Boasts of knowing more than the Divines) does not understand what he reads. *Moses* means, that the Blood of Beasts could take away that Guilt of Offences against the Law, which exposed the Offender to an untimely Death, and so save him from dying by the Hand of the Magistrate, or by an immediate Judgment of God; just as Money, that purchases a King's Pardon, takes away a condemned Rebel's Guilt. But after this Pardon, still the Offender is mortal, and must die; and neither a King's Pardon, nor the Legal Sacrifices can, or could purchase for him a Resurrection from the Dead, and eternal Life. This is what *St. Paul* means when he says, that the Blood of Beasts cannot take away Sin. And thus it appears, that there is not the least Disagreement between *Moses* and *Paul*. *Moses* never said, that Legal Sacrifices could procure Men a Resurrection. And *Paul* never denied their Virtue to sanctify to the purifying of the Flesh, and to save Men from the untimely Death threaten'd to Offenders in the Law.

He next says, p. 42. *Moses* commands all Idolatry to be exterminated by Fire and Sword, not only in Canaan, but all the rest of the World, so far as his People should have it in their Power: But *St. Paul* strictly forbids all Wars and Violence upon this account, and leaves every Man to judge for himself. Here our Author, according to his Custom, is forced to falsify in order to make *Moses* and *Paul* seem to differ. *Moses* indeed commanded all Idolatry to be extirpated in Canaan, but gave no Orders about all the rest of the World. Nay, he never expected, that it would be in the Power of the Jews to exterminate Idolatry by Fire and Sword in all Nations; on the contrary he directed them to live at home in Canaan, and to go up to Jerusalem three times in every Year, and so left them no time to exterminate Idolatry in all the rest of the World. It was absolutely

absolutely necessary, that Idolatry should be suppressed in Canaan, and all Idolaters there punished with *Death*, because *Jehovah* was the *King of Canaan*; and the *Worship* of any Idol there was *High-Treason* and *Rebellion*. As to our Author's Fling, viz. That *Moses* was *very confident*, tho' he was *not certain*, that *his People* would have it in their *Power* to exterminate Idolatry in all the *Nations* of the Earth; I pass it by, because he himself *knows* that it is false in *Fact*. *Moses* was for leaving other *Nations*, where he had *no Authority*, to judge for themselves. And when *St. Paul* leaves every *Man* to judge for himself, he does not condemn *Moses's* punishing *High-Treason* and *Rebellion* in *Canaan* with *Death*. If the *Almighty* were the *King* of any *Nation* now in the *immediate* Manner as he was of *Canaan*, that *Nation* must also punish Idolatry with *Death* in all its *own Subjects*, and in all that would come to dwell therein. But since no *Nation* is in this *Circumstance*, therefore all *Nations* must now leave *Conscience* to the *sole Force of Reason and Evidence*. *Moses's* Rule was good while the *Theocracy* continued. But now the *Case* is alter'd, and the *Theocracy* is at an end, the *Apostle's* Rule must take place. Here is then no *Contradiction*.

Again, with a *View* to prove that *St. Paul* contradicts *Moses*, this *Philosopher* says, p. 42. *Moses* instituted a *Priesthood* which was to govern the *Nation* as *Vicegerents of God*, and to drain all the *Wealth* and *Treasures* of the *Kingdom* into the *Church*; as they must necessarily have done, had his *Law* been strictly executed: But *St. Paul* left the *Christian Ministry* to subsist only upon *Charity*. Supposing now, that our *Philosopher* has represented *Facts* truly as they are, still I ask him, Where is the *Contradiction* between *Moses* and *Paul*? They do not speak of the same *Thing*. *Moses* speaks of the *Jewish Priesthood*, *Paul* of the *Christian Ministry*. *Moses* does not say, that the *Christian Ministry* should not subsist upon *Charity*: and *Paul* does not say, that the *Jewish Priesthood* should not have had the *Provision* which the *Mosaic Law* made for them. So that they do not contradict one another. But it is false

in Fact, that *Moses* instituted a Priesthood to draw in all the Wealth of the Kingdom into the Church. For *Moses* in the Beginning established a Statute of *Mortmain*, and made it *perpetual*, by which the Priests and Levites were made incapable of purchasing any *Lands*: In lieu of which the First-fruits and Tithes were given them, *Numb. xviii. 23, 24.* Indeed the *Levites* were to be allow'd forty-eight Cities with their Suburbs to live in, and to keep their Cattle, *Numb. xxxv. 2, 7.* But this was nothing in Comparison of what they must have had, if they had been allow'd to share their Proportion of Land with the other Tribes. It appears from *Numb. xxvi.* that the *Levites* above twenty Years old were about an eightieth Part of the *Israelites* of the same Age. An eightieth Part of the Land then would have fallen to their Share, if they had been allowed to *inherit* Land. In the stead of this, the First-fruits, Tithes, &c. were given them, which amounted to about a fifth Part of the *Product* of the Land: which was indeed an ample Satisfaction for their not being permitted to inherit Land. But still they could not draw in *all* the Wealth of the Kingdom into the Church: Since the *Laitie* reserved to themselves *all the Lands*, and *four* Parts in five of the *Product* of them, according to the original Directions of *Moses*. Now though our Author could not but know this to be the Case, yet he has ventured to say, *p. 128.* that the *Revenues* of the *Levites* amounted to *full twenty Shillings a Pound upon all the Lands in Israel.* I have heard of Addressers in the Plenitude of their loyal Zeal offering their King twenty Shillings in the Pound for a Land-tax: But that after Men *that had no Trade*, had actually given away full twenty Shillings in the Pound, they should have enough left to maintain their Families, is more than even the Genius of a *Newton* could make out. I am sure, I am dull enough to fancy, that if I had an Acre of Land which produced only one Pound Sterling in a Year, and should give out of the Products of that Land twenty Shillings, nay, according to our Author's emphatical way of speaking, *full twenty Shillings a Year*

to a Priest, I should have nothing remaining from thence; and if I had no Trade neither, I could have nothing at all. Our Author's saying, that St. Paul *left the Christian Ministry to subsist only upon Charity*, is a palpable Misrepresentation. For St. Paul expressly says, that as they who *ministred about holy Things* in the Temple *did live of the Things of the Temple*, so hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel, 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14. So that Christian Ministers no more subsist upon Charity, than Physicians, Counsellors, or Kings. For if the Law of Nature, and the Law of the Land have ordained, that these should live by Fees, or Taxes: So hath the Lord ordained, that Christian Ministers should live of the Gospel. Let him prove, that Fees and Taxes are not Alms, and I will prove that Christian Ministers competent Salaries are not Alms neither. They are *due*, because the Lord has ordained them, *i.e.* by divine Right.

Afterward he adds, p. 51. that Paul declared the Law to be a carnal, worldly, blinding, and enslaving Constitution, when Moses had delivered it as the distinguishing Privilege of the People of God. But our Author knew, that St. Paul was of the same Opinion with Moses in this Respect, according to what he says, Rom. iii. 1, 2. *The Jews have much Advantage above the Gentiles, particularly because the Oracles of God were committed to them.* This was a vast Advantage above what the Heathens enjoy'd. And yet it is obviously true, as St. Paul represents it, that the Law was carnal, worldly, and enslaving in comparison of the Gospel. The Apostle's speaking thus diminutively of the Law in comparison of the Gospel, cannot, by any one but our New Philosopher, be esteemed a plain Declaration, that such a Law could never be of divine Institution. And 'tis certain, that the Apostle never intended to make such a Declaration, because he often asserts, as our Author knew, that the Law of Moses was of divine Institution. He expressly calls it, *The Oracles of God*, in the Text last cited; and cites the Books of Moses as the *Word of God*, Heb. x. 30. and says, that Moses was *faithful in God's House*, iii. 5.

and solemnly declared, that he believed all Things which are written in the Law. Acts xxiv. 14.

Our Author next advances, p. 54. that if St. Paul had thought the Law to have been an Institution of God, and afterwards abrogated by the same Authority, he could not have submitted to it consistent with his declared Judgment and Conscience. It does not appear that the Law, upon the first calling of the Gentiles, was so far abrogated as to make it sinful for the Jews to comply with its Institutions : But their Compliance continued indifferent till the Destruction of the Temple. So that for the sake of pleasing the Jews, it was lawful for the Apostle to purify himself as a Nazarite, in compliance with the Law, Acts xxi. 24, 26. Accordingly, he could with the greatest Sincerity declare, that he did not teach the Jews, that they ought not to circumcise their Children, nor to walk after the Customs, v. 21. For his real Doctrine was, that the Gentiles must not submit to the Law of Moses ; while yet it was lawful for a Jewish Christian to do it, when he could thereby promote a good End. He did not say, that it was a Sin for a Jewish Christian to circumcise his Children ; and accordingly he consented that Timothy should be circumcised, because his Mother was a Jewess ; tho' he would not bear, that Titus should be circumcised, because he was wholly a Greek, Acts xvi. 3. Gal. ii. 3. St. Paul never shuffled, as our Author would persuade us to believe, but steadily defended, and on all proper Occasions own'd, the Gospel, which he had preached among the Gentiles, which was, that the Gentiles must not be circumcised, nor observe the Law, Gal. v. 1--4. The Council at Jerusalem was of the same Opinion with him, and did not (as our Philosopher pretends, p. 60.) leave the Jewish Converts under an Obligation to the whole Law of Moses. Nay, St. Peter declared in the Council, that the Law was a Yoke which neither their Fathers, nor they were able to bear, and that the Jews were to be saved (not by the Law, but) by the Grace of Christ, even as they of the Gentile World were to be saved, Acts xv. 10, 11. And when
St.

St. James had made a Motion that the Gentiles should be required to abstain from Pollutions of Idols, and Fornication, Things strangled and Blood; he adds, that there would be no need particularly to inculcate this Abstinance on the Jewish Converts, since Moses was read in the Synagogues every Sabbath-day, v. 20, 21. The Council then did not oblige the Jewish Converts to obey the Law of Moses, but only left the Thing indifferent to them. And whatever our Author fancies, p. 56, 57. St. Paul was perfectly well satisfied with this Decree, as is evident from his never contradicting it, either when it was passing, or afterward, and from his delivering the Decree to the Churches to keep wherever he travel'd, Acts xvi. 4. Agreeable to this also was all his Discourse and Conduct upon all Occasions. He determined, that eating Meats offer'd to Idols *as such* (which was the Thing forbidden in the Decree) was absolutely *unlawful* in itself, 1 Cor. x. 20. and that upon Supposition it had not been in itself unlawful, yet it would be necessary to avoid it, when our doing it would encourage others to do it against their Consciences, 1 Cor. viii. 7---11. St. Paul did not teach, that it was a Sin for a Jewish Christian to walk according to the Law; but constantly and uniformly taught, that tho' he was not bound in Conscience to do it, yet it was necessary in some Circumstances in order to avoid giving Offense, 1 Cor. x. 27---29. When the Law of Moses was set aside, upon the Calling of the Gentiles, it was *lawful* for the converted Jews to eat the Meats that had been prohibited as unclean by the Law: But still it was no Sin in them voluntarily to abstain from them, when their eating of them would have given Offense. Accordingly St. Paul determines, that he would not eat Flesh while the World stands, if this would make his Brother to offend, viii. 13. He farther adds, *Tho' I be free from all Men, yet I have made myself a Servant to all, that I might gain the more. Unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the Law, as under the Law, that that I might gain them that are under the Law; to them*
that

that are not subject to the Law of Moses, as not being subject to the Law, that I might gain them that are not subject to the Law, 1 Cor. ix. 19.--21. Thus the Apostle was perfectly consistent with himself. While he would not suffer the Law to be imposed on the Gentiles; and did not think that the Law had any longer an Authority over him: Yet he knew it was lawful for him to yield voluntary Obedience to the Law, whenever this was necessary to avoid Offense. And thus the great Apostle's Character is perfectly clear. See Mr. Locke's Note on *Ephes. ii. 15.*

Our Author is mistaken in supposing, that the Decree of the Council at Jerusalem designed to impose a Law of Proselytism upon the Gentile Converts, p. 76. The Decree was not intended to make them Proselytes to the Law of Moses, or to any part thereof. It was designed to impose upon them four Things which were made necessary long before the Law of Moses was in being. Abstinence from Blood, and consequently from Things strangled, was enjoined upon Noah, and in him upon all Mankind, Gen. ix. 4. Abstinence from Fornication, and from Things offer'd to Idols as such, was enjoined on all Mankind by the Law of Nature. If our Author had observed this, he would not have talk'd of the Council's connecting Things indifferent with things necessary. For they were all made necessary, by the divine Commands, to all Mankind, long before Moses was born. And herein St. Paul never differ'd from the Council. It was therefore very wrong in our Author to represent Paul and the other Apostles as preaching quite different Gospels, and as differing about the most essential Points, p. 80. For tho' Peter once disssembled in Conduct, yet he always preached the same Gospel as Paul, as we learn from his *Epistles*, and from his *Speeches* in the *Acts*. And if our Author had impartially examined, he would have found, that when St. Paul speaks of his Gospel, he does not call it so to distinguish it from the Gospel of Peter and the other Apostles, but from the Gospel that was taught by the False Apostle, who opposed him. St. Paul expressly says, that the

Mystery,

Mystery, which was reveled to him, was reveled to the other Apostles also, *Ephes.* iii. 5. Agreeably to this, when St. Paul speaks of his having received his Gospel by *immediate Revelation* from Christ, he would not thereby insinuate, as if his Gospel was not the same as what was reveled to the other Apostles, but only that he did not learn his Gospel from any Men; and that he was as well qualified to be a Teacher of Christianity as the other Apostles were, *Gal.* i. 1, 11, 12. ii. 6--9.

Our Author next enters upon the Subject of *Miracles*, and tells us, *that the Power of working Miracles has no Connexion with the Truth of the Doctrines taught by such Miracle-workers*; and that since *false Prophets might and did work Miracles, these can be no Evidence of Truth*, p. 81. This Philosopher pretends a Respect for Christ and Paul, and yet in saying this, he could not but know, that he directly *contradicts* them. Our blessed Savior continually appealed to his Miracles as an Evidence of the Truth of his Doctrine. *I (says he) have greater Witness than that of John: for the Works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same Works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me,* John v. 36. See also *John* x. 37, 38. xiv. 10, 11. St. Paul says, that Miracles are *the Signs of an Apostle*, or Evidences that a Man was taught and sent by God, *2 Cor.* xii. 12. and that the Gospel which was first spoken by the Lord, was confirm'd to us by them that heard him, God also bearing them witness both with Signs and Wonders, and with divers Miracles, and Gifts of the Holy Ghost, *Heb.* ii. 3, 4. It is no manner of Objection to this, that false Prophets have been sometimes permitted to work Miracles: For in that Case God has always taken care to make it evident, to every impartial Inquirer, on which Side the Truth and the Divine Commission lay. To this end, he always gave his Servants a manifest and complete *Victory* over their Antagonists. When Moses had wrought one Miracle, and the Magicians had done the same, a Spectator must necessarily be in doubt. But when Moses tied up their Hands, and went on performing many Miracles, which they

they could not do; and even forced them to acknowledge the Finger of God in his Miracles, the Spectators had not the least room to doubt, but that *Moses's* God was the *Most High*, and that *Moses* was really *sent* and commission'd by him. And in all Cases of Opposition and Contest, a good and faithful God will take care, that his Servants shall have such a *complete* and *manifest* Victory as shall be sufficient to determine every *impartial* Inquirer. Hence it is, that our Savior said, that false Prophets, by their Miracles, should, *if it were possible*, deceive the Elect, *Matth. xxiv. 24.* It is not possible they should be deceived, because God will not suffer *false* Prophets to produce such Evidence as *he* will give on the side of Truth. As to our Author's saying, that the *Power of working Miracles has no Connexion with the Truth of Doctrines*, it is very trifling. Tho' these Things have not an *immediate*, yet they have a *mediate* Connexion with one another. The Case is very plain to all that have not puzzled their Heads with Metaphysics. *Miracles*, where there is no Opposition (as in the Case of Christ and his Apostles) and *Victory* in working Miracles, where there is Opposition (as in the Case of *Moses* and the Magicians) immediately prove that the Men who work them were *taught* and *sent* by God, since no Man could do such Miracles unless God were with him. By the Miracles then, which God does by his Servants, he testifies that he is with them, that he sent them, employs them, and approves of the Doctrines they teach. He does hereby as good as say to us, ' I have taught these Men what to revele to you; I bear witness to them, by Miracles and Victory, that they are *faithful* Men: I know I can *trust* them to give you an exact Account of what I have taught them. If I could not trust them, if I foresaw they would falsify, I would not stand by and own them. But by my owning them in this manner, I assure you, that I know them to be such as will *never falsify*, or attempt to deceive you. Take my word for it, you may depend upon the Truth of all they teach'. Thus Miracles are a plain Proof of the Truth of Doctrines, or, in our Author's Language, thus the *certain Truth of revealed*

veled Propositions is connected with the necessary Veracity of God. And now it appears, that when the Apostles *speak to us as from God, we do not take their word for it, but God's.* His bearing witness that they teach us the Truth, is a *divine Foundation of our Faith* : So that there is another *infallible Mark of Truth* besides the Reason of the Thing, and that is, *God's confirming the Mission of his Prophets by Miracles.* And in this Way it may be made *certain*, that a positive Command came from God.

What this new Philosopher talks, a bout the Christian Doctrine of the *Sacrifice of Christ*, is mere *Cant*, and nothing to the Purpose. He says, *p. 149, 150. that God must have accepted Penitents, whether Christ had died or not* : And yet I believe he is sensible, that there is no Unrighteousness in condemning Rebels to death, and in refusing to pardon them upon any Terms. When Men have forfeited their Lives, their Repentance cannot give them a *Right to Pardon*. He goes on lashing the Expressions of some Divines, who, have talk'd incautiously of this Matter. But the true Scripture-Docctrine of the Sacrifice of Christ is not liable to any of his Objections. He tells us, *Our Systematical Divines have been always exceedingly puzzled, when they attempt to reconcile the Necessity of a prior Satisfaction with the Freedom of a Pardon upon Repentance, p. 150.* But if his Head is puzzled, by drinking in the midst of his Sermon, *p. 138.* other Men's are not. The Scripture-Docctrine of the Sacrifice of Christ is exceedingly natural and easy. Mankind were all condemn'd to death. *In Adam all die.* God's *essential Attribute of Mercy* disposed him to *Forgiveness in his own Nature.* Hereupon he laid a Design of impowering his Son to raise the Dead, and to give to penitent Sinners eternal Life : But at the same time, for infinitely wise Reasons, he determined not to give Christ this Authority, unless he would, as a *Condition of receiving it*, go down from Heaven, dwell among Men as one of them, and permit them to shed his Blood. Christ consented and performed the Condition : Whereupon he was highly exalted, and received

all Authority in Heaven and in Earth, particularly an Authority over all Flesh, that he should give eternal Life to as many as believe in, and obey, him. As then Christ's dying was the *Condition* of his receiving Authority to save penitent Sinners, we may very properly say, that his Death purchased Salvation for them. This Condition was insisted on, in order to demonstrate, that tho' God is merciful, yet he is at the same time perfectly holy, and intensely hates all Sin. It was *necessary* then that this *Condition* should be performed; and yet still the Pardon granted Sinners, upon Repentance, is perfectly *free*. God might have refused to grant Pardon upon *any Terms* at all: It was mere Grace in him to send his Son to redeem us: It was mere Grace to appoint that his Death should be the Condition of our Salvation: And it was mere Grace to insist on such *low Terms* on our part, as Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ. Suppose a Set of Rebels against the King were condemned to die, and confined in a close and nasty Prison; suppose his Mercy inclined him to pardon them upon their Repentance, if he could do it in such a manner as would secure the Authority of his Government, and the Honour of his Laws. Suppose then the King would give the Prince an Authority to forgive and release these Rebels, provided he would go and live with them in the Prison a little while, and try to bring them to Repentance. Upon the Prince's performing this Condition, he would receive this Authority; and upon the Rebels repenting they would be pardon'd. Here every one sees, that the *Necessity* of the Prince's performing the *Condition* is perfectly consistent with the *Freedom* of the *Pardon* upon Repentance; since the King was not obliged to pardon upon any Terms at all; and it was Grace in him to pardon the Rebels on the Terms mention'd. In like manner it is an Instance of sovereign Grace in God to accept us at all; He might have left us under the Power of Death for ever without a Resurrection. It was Grace in him to appoint a Method of restoring us, and to ordain that the Death of Christ should be the Condition

of his receiving Authority to save us. So that while it was *necessary* Christ should *die*, if we were to be redeem'd *at all*, yet the *Pardon* we receive is *free*, because God might have refused to redeem us at all. What has been said shews how idle it is to talk, as this Philosopher does, of the Necessity of *paying the Price of Redemption to the Devil*, p. 156. For the Price which Christ was to pay, was intended to purchase *for himself an Authority* to raise the Dead, and to give eternal Life to penitent Sinners. As this Authority could be bestowed by none but God, the Price of purchasing it must be paid *to him*. And when Christ paid this Price he thereby purchased an Authority to conquer Satan, and to deliver Men, by Force and Power, out of the Hands of him that had the Power of Death, that is, the Devil, *Heb. ii. 14.*

This Philosopher adds, p. 154. *However free and voluntary the Obedience of Christ was, yet it was a necessary Obligation laid upon him by the Will of God.* From hence our Author would have us infer, that there could be no such Merit in the Death of Christ as we speak of. But he quite mistakes the Case. Christ's submitting to undergo *undeserved* Sufferings and Death was *voluntary*: And if he had not voluntarily consented to it, his Father would not have laid him under any Obligation in the Case. The same Reasons, which made it fit for Christ to consent to be incarnate and die, made it fit for the Father to order it: And the same Reasons, which made it fit for the Father to order it, made it fit for the Son to consent. But still the Son's *free Consent* was *necessary* in the Case; since the Things now required of him were not his *Natural Duty*, but his submitting to *undeserved* Hardships and Sufferings. These voluntary Sufferings then merited for him the Exaltation and Authority that were promised him, even an Authority to save us.

Our Author farther says, *Christ himself seems to have no such Notion of the Necessity of his Death, as an indispensable Condition of the Salvation of Mankind, when he prayed so often, and earnestly, not to be put upon any such*

Trial, and that if possible this Cup of Sorrow might pass from him, p. 155. Our Author, I suppose, could not but know, that some very ingenious and learned Men have thought, that when Christ prayed the Cup might pass from him, he did not speak of his *Death*, which he certainly knew must happen; but of some *sudden, unexpected*, dreadful Sorrow. If this was the Case, as it might have been for any thing our Author has proved to the contrary, all the Difficulty vanishes in a Moment. But supposing that the *Cup* signifies *Death*, still Christ's Prayer is perfectly consistent with his believing that his Death was the Condition of Men's Salvation. For he did not pray that the Cup might pass from him *at all Events*, but only *if it were possible*: The Sense of his Prayer was this, 'Father, if it be possible to save Mankind without my dying a Sacrifice for them, I pray to be delivered from Death. But if this is not possible, if my Death be the indispensable Condition of their Salvation, I consent: *Not my Will, but thine be done*'. He did not desire to be saved from dying, unless it were *possible* for Mankind to be saved in *some other Way*. So that here was perfect Love to the Souls of Men.

He represents *St. Paul* as meaning by the Doctrine of Propitiation, only that *Christ sealed his Religion as a Martyr with his Blood, p. 164.* Whereas the contrary is very evident from many Passages in his Epistles. *St. Paul* argues, that *if one died for all, then all were dead, 2 Cor. v. 14. i. e.* It may be infer'd from Christ's dying for all Men, that all Men were become mortal, or condemn'd to die. This Argument is good, if Christ's Death was a Sacrifice, or the Condition of his receiving Authority to raise all Mankind from the Dead: But if he had died only as a Martyr, no Man can see any Force in the Apostle's Reasoning. *Paul* died a Martyr, and yet it cannot be infer'd from thence, that all Men are condemn'd to die. The Apostle's Argument therefore demonstrates, that *he* thought, Christ died not only as a Martyr, but as a Sacrifice too. *St. Paul* says, *we are justified by Christ's Blood, Rom.*

v. 9. *i. e.* the shedding his Blood was the Term, or Condition of our being justified: As the Expression, *justified by Faith*, signifies that Faith is the Condition of Justification. Again the Apostle says, *Gal. iii. 13. 14. Christ hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse, that is, hang'd on a Tree for us, that the Blessing of Abraham might come upon the Gentiles: i. e.* the Crucifixion of Christ was the Condition and Mean of the Gentiles receiving the Blessing of Abraham. This plainly shews, that Christ's Death was not merely the Death of a Prophet and Martyr, since in that Case his *living*, and not being crucified, would have been more adapted to convey the Blessing of Abraham to the Gentiles by his Preaching and Miracles, than his Death could be. Paul was only a Martyr, and accordingly his Death was not a Mean or Condition of carrying the Gospel to the Gentiles, but his Life was more needful for this Purpose, as himself testifies, *Phil. i. 23, 24. I have a Desire (says he) to depart, and to be with Christ, which is far better for myself, but to abide in the Flesh is more needful for you.* And if Christ had not been really a Sacrifice, if his Death had not been necessary to make Atonement for us, his abiding in the Flesh also would have been more needful for Mankind than his Death. Farther, St. Paul says, *Gal. ii. 21. If Righteousness came by the Law, then Christ died in vain.* From which reasoning of the Apostle it evidently follows, that if Righteousness, or Justification, could have come by the Law, or any other Way whatsoever, *i. e.* if God could consistently with his Wisdom have accepted and rewarded us as righteous upon any lower Condition than that of the Sufferings and Death of Christ, then Christ died in vain: Since, upon this Supposition, he would have died to procure either what was before procured in another, or what might have been procured in an easier Way. But Christ did not die in vain: Consequently (accordingly to St. Paul's Argument) we could not have been accepted as righteous without his Death, *i. e.* his Death was the necessary Condition of our Salvation, or a Sacrifice for us.

The

The moral Philosopher is right in saying, p. 201. That *all Means* (or positive Institutions) of God's Appointment must have a natural Relation to, and Connexion with the End, and be necessary in the Reason, Fitness, and mutual Dependency of Things to obtain such an End. But he is as wrong in adding, that *there is no rational Connexion either natural or moral, between the external Rituals, Baptism and the Lord's Super, and any internal Virtue, or true Religion, either in Act or Habit.* For the Question is, What is the End, which these Rituals are the Means of promoting? Baptism is not, as he represents it, a Mean of purifying the Soul: nor was the *Elementary part of the Eucharist* ever intended as a Mean of conveying Grace. The End of Baptism is to be a Door into the Christian Church, and a Sign, and Admonition to us, that we should die to Sin and walk in Newness of Life, *Rom. vi. 4.* as Persons regenerated, *Titus iii. 5.* Now Baptism naturally answers this End, and therefore God, who saw it to be fit for this Purpose, did in his Wisdom appoint it. The End of the Lord's Super is to eat and drink in Remembrance of Christ, and to shew forth his Death, as our Author well knew. And he is as sensible, that the End of calling us to remember Christ, and to shew forth his Death is, that we excite ourselves to imitate and obey him, as well as to love and serve God. And surely our Author himself must own, that there is a natural and rational Connexion between these Things. I would add, that if we could not see this Connexion, yet when the allwise God has appointed any thing as a Mean to an End, we ought to submit to his Wisdom, and believe that there is such a Connexion. For we cannot have higher Evidence of the Truth of any Thing, than the Testimony of God. Our Author declares himself to believe all this, and to apply it to Baptism and the Lord's Super, provided it could be proved, that they were Christian Institutions, p. 202, 203. He says, they were not *instituted by Christ, but were in use before, as National Customs among the Jews.* This looks to me a little like playing upon Words. Suppose that *Bap-*
tismal

hymnal Water, and Elementary Bread and Wine were in use before : Yet these were not *Christian Baptism*, or the *Lord's Super*. It is true, that *John the Baptist* baptised before Christ did. But it is as true, that Christ's Baptism was *different* from *John's* ; as is evident from the Testimony of *St. Paul*, who required such as had already received *John's Baptism*, *afterward* to receive *Christian Baptism*, *Acts* xix. 3.---6. And that Christ really instituted Baptism is as plain as Words can make it, from *Matt.* xxviii. 19. *Go teach all Nations, baptising them, &c.* If this Command of Christ to his Apostles did institute *teaching*, I am sure it also instituted *Baptism*. He says, *it is certain, that the Jews baptised every Proselyte*, and that this was *their Custom many Ages before our Savior's Time*, p. 104, 105. But this is not so certain as our Author fancies. And before he asserts it again, I desire him to read and confute *Dr. Gale's Ninth Letter* in his *Reflexions on Dr. Wall's Hist. of Infant Baptism*. Nay, that baptising was a *new Thing* in our Savior's Time, appears from that Question of the *Jews* to *John the Baptist*, *Why baptisest thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias, nor the Prophet*, *John* i. 25. This plainly implies, that no one among them at that time pretended to baptise, because they did not think, that the *Messiah* or *Elias* were come. *John's Baptism* then was entirely a *New Thing* ; and Christ's was different from his, and so was truly a *Christian Institution*. *John* baptised only *Jews*, Christ ordered his Baptism to be administred to all Nations. *John's Baptism* was *not*, but Christ's *was*, into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. As to the *Lord's Super*, it is evidently an Institution of Christ. Our Author says, p. 204. that *our Savior sanctified and applied to a religious Use a National Custom of banding about Bisket, and a Cup of Wine after Super, and ordered that for the future it should be done in his Name*, p. 107. But he has not proved, that this was a National Custom among the *Jews*, in and before our Savior's Time. I am sure the Gospels imply the contrary. For *St. Luke* expressly tells us, that our Savior took the *Passover-Cup*, and gave
Thanks,

Thanks, and bid the Disciples divide it among themselves before he instituted the Lord's Super, *Luke xxii. 17.—20.* This is the Cup *after Super*, of which our Author speaks. But Christ did not order that *this* Cup should be distributed in his Name. On the other hand, he appointed *another* Cup *afterward* for this Purpose. So that the Lord's Super was intirely distinct from the *Jewish* Meal, and was in all respects a *new* Institution. And as the Gospels are inconsistent with our Author's History of the *Jewish* Passover and other Suppers, so he is directly contradicted by *Jewish* Writers, who expressly say, that the Master of the Family eats of the *Flesh* of the Passover *last of all*, and after this tastes not of any Food. See Dr. *Lightfoot*, Vol. II. p. 258. But it is no Wonder we find our Author writes History by Invention. I cannot help adding, that as there is no Foundation to suppose that the Bread Christ broke to represent his Crucifixion was a part of the *Paschal* Super; so neither is there any room to imagine that the Cup he appointed to represent his Blood was a Cup belonging to that Super. What the modern *Jews*, in Dr. *Lightfoot*, talk of four Cups at the Passover, relates to Times since our Savior's Days. And to suppose that Christ adopted the third of them into his Super, and afterward partook of the fourth also, introduces strange Confusion, and contradicts our Savior's saying, after the Cup that preceded his Super, that he would no more drink of Wine, till he did it in God's Kingdom, *Luke xxii. 18.*

This Writer tells us, p. 244, that *whatsoever is ascribed to the Sacrifice of Christ, must take off from the Obligation and Necessity of personal Obedience.* Here our Author shews, that he does not understand the Doctrine he opposes. The Truth of the Case is, that we were naturally obliged to yield *perfect* Obedience to the Will of God, the Reward of which was to be *eternal* Life. But since we have sined, and our Obedience is *not perfect*, we have *forfeited* eternal Life. It must then be mere Grace in God to reward our *imperfect* Obedience with eternal Life, the Reward of *Perfection.* The
Sacrifice

Sacrifice of Christ purchased this Favor for us, or, which is the same Thing in other Words, his voluntary Submission to undeserved Sufferings and Death was the Condition of his receiving Authority to accept and reward our sincere, tho' *imperfect* Obedience, as if it were *perfect*; or in St. Paul's Language, Faith is imputed for Righteousness. What we ascribe then to the Sacrifice of Christ does not take off from the Obligation and Necessity of *personal* Obedience. It takes off indeed from the Necessity of *perfect* Obedience, so that we may be saved, tho' our Obedience be *not* perfect: But still it leaves us under the strongest Obligations to *personal*, sincere Obedience, as absolutely *necessary* to Salvation. He must not be offended with my using his own Words, p. 226. *It is astonishing, methinks, that our Moral Philosopher should not see this, and that he should be so much puzzled and perplexed, where there is really no Difficulty.*

He does not stick to affirm, that *the History of the Exodus, and Conquest of Canaan, is written in a Dramatic Way*; and that if we should take this Drama in the obvious literal Sense, we must suppose Moses to have been a more fabulous, romantic Writer than Homer, Æsop, Ovid, or any of the Heathen Poets and Mythologists, p. 251. To make this appear, he dresses up the Story in as ridiculous a Manner as he could: But if he had reported only the *Plain Truth*, he could not have answered his End. It is false to say, that *Moses represents God appearing like Man, as a finite circumscribed Being*: Since he expressly says, that the *Jews saw no manner of Similitude*, Deut. iv. 12, 15. The Meaning of which Expression our Author *knows* to be, that God did not appear in any *Shape*. And since *Moses* assigns this as a *Reason* why the *Jews* should not make an *Image* of God, it is evident, *Moses intended* to say, that God *never* appeared in any Shape: Since his not appearing in any Shape at *one time*, would have been no Argument against making Images of God, provided he had

F

appear'd

appear'd in human Shape at another Time. Whosoever appeared in *human Shape* to *Abraham*, *Lot*, &c. was an *Angel*, and not God. That which represented God was a *Cloud of Light and Glory*, which had no *Similitude*, i. e. it had no Shape, it was not like Man, Bird, Beast, Fish, or any other finite circumscribed Being. Whatever *Moses* says about God's *appearing* must be interpreted consistently with this plain Declaration, that *Men had seen no manner of Similitude*. If this will oblige us to interpret some of his Expressions in a *figurative* Manner, the Figure will be infinitely less bold than that to which this Philosopher has recourse. God's talking with *Moses Face to Face*, (*Exod. xxxiii. 11.*) it is evident, cannot signify his appearing in any *Shape*, because it is said, that God talked with all the *Israelites Face to Face in the Mount*, when yet they saw *no manner of Similitude*, *Deut. v. 4.* The plain Meaning is, that he did not imploy a Prophet to declare his Mind to them, but he spoke to them *directly* from the *Cloud of Glory*, as being himself immediately present with them. And his conversing with *Moses as a Man talketh with his Friend*, must be considered as set in *Opposition* to the Manner of his delivering the Law from Mount Sinai: Here he spoke with *Terror* as a *Sovereign* and Judge; but he spoke to *Moses* in a *mild* and tender Way. And what is there in this that looks *romantic*? It is true, that the infinite God cannot go from Place to Place: And accordingly *Moses* does not say he did. But as the Cloud of Glory represented God, God may, by a very easy Figure, be said to go, wherever that Cloud of Glory went. It is therefore far enough from being *romantic* for *Moses* to say, that God (i. e. the Cloud of Glory representing him) *went out of Egypt at the Head of the Israelite Army, and walked with them thro' the Red Sea, that he* (i. e. his Glory) *travelled up and down with them forty Years in the Wilderness*. As to what the *Immortal Philosopher* adds, that God *was always at the Beck or Call of Moses*; he knows it is a *Misrepresentation*. To be at the Beck of *Moses* is an
Ex-

Expression infinitely too mean in this Place. *Joshua* was at the *Beck* of *Moses*; but *Moses* always behaved himself with the utmost Humility and Submission towards God. Yet our Author adds, *In the literal Sense of the Story, such was the Interest of Moses with God, that he could make him do whatever he pleased.* If he had not been a very superficial Reader, or resolved to write false History, he could not have said this. It is really impious in him to say, that *Moses could make God do whatever he pleas'd*, when God, several times, denied *Moses* the thing he asked. *Moses* earnestly desired that he might not be sent from *Midian* into *Egypt* to require *Pharaoh* to release the *Israelites*. Yet God would not hear him in this Request, but was angry with him for standing out so long, and insisted upon his Obedience, *Exod.* iv. 13, 14. At another time *Moses* said to God, *I beseech thee shew me thy Glory.* Yet God would not do it, but answered, *Thou canst not see my Face* [i. e. my Glory:] *for there shall no Man see me and live,* *Exod.* xxxiii. 18, 20. Our Author could not but know, that his Expression was too strong, when he said, that *Moses often changed God's Mind, when he had resolved to destroy the People.* The real Truth was, that the People by their Sins provoked God to destroy them: hereupon God threatened and spoke of destroying them; then *Moses* earnestly interceded for them; and so God was pleased to spare them. *Deut.* ix. 7,---26. And in this there is nothing odd, or inconsistent with the divine Perfections.

He adds, *Moses gain'd his Ends in every thing but the main Point, which was the Conquest of the Country, which the Israelites were never able to do till David's time, about 400 Years after the Promise to Abraham was expired,* p. 253. When our Author says, *the Israelites were not able to do the Conquest of the Country,* I suppose he means, they were not able to effect the Conquest. But why were they not able to conquer all *Canaan*? Does not the *Caviler* know, that the Reason assigned, is because the *Israelites* were unbelieving and disobedient? It

is expressly said, that because *they did Evil, the Lord sold them into the Hand of the King of Canaan*, Judg. iv. 1, 2. When they *repented* and *cried* for Mercy, then God inabled them to conquer that King of Canaan, v. 3, 23, 24. They very soon *did Evil* again, and then God delivered them into the Hand of *Midian*, vi. 1, 2. It was intirely the Fault of that *Generation* who came out of *Egypt*, that *they* had not conquered the Land; it was their *Murmuring* and *Disobedience* that provoked God to resolve to destroy them in the Wilderness, *Numb.* xiv. 27,---35. When God made the Promise to *Abraham*, that he would give his *Seed all the Land of Canaan*, Gen. xvii. 8. he did not fix the Time of accomplishing the Promise: and therefore he was not obliged to fulfil it in the Days of *Joshua*, but might defer the Accomplishment, till the Time of *David*. And if our Philosopher were not a *superficial* Reader, he would have observed, that when God *specified* the Time of the *Israelites* passing from *Egypt* to *Canaan*, he does not say, that they should immediately conquer the *whole* of it: The Words are, *In the fourth Generation they shall come hither again*, Gen. xv. 16. And they did *come into Canaan* at the time appointed. When the Time was fix'd in the Promise, there was no mention made of their conquering ALL the Land, but only of their *coming thither*; and this was fulfill'd at the time. But when the Conquest of ALL the Land was promised, then *no time* was fixed. So that the divine Promises were punctually fulfil'd.

Our Author adds, *They could not drive the Inhabitants out of the Plains, because they had Chariots of Iron, or because God never inabled them as Infantry to stand before the Canaanite Horse*. This is really a very silly Cavil, which, our Author knows, has been confuted over and over. And if he had had the least Grain of *Morality* in him, he would honestly have told his Readers, what the Christian Commentators had said to this. He alludes to the *English* Translation of *Judges* i. 19. *The Lord*

Lord was with Judah, and he drove out the Inhabitants of the Mountain, but could not drive out the Inhabitants of the Valley, because they had Chariots of Iron. Now, I will venture positively to say, that our *Moral Philosopher* does not believe that it was the Intention of the sacred *Historian* to teach us, that *God could not* drive out the Inhabitants, *because they had Chariots of Iron.* If he will but honestly own this, there will be no room for any Sneer; since every one sees, at first sight, that the sacred *Historian* was not capable of delivering such Blasphemy against God, whose Wisdom, Power, and Sovereignty he magnifies upon all Occasions; it is a plain Case, that the Text must have another Meaning than what the caviling Philosopher would put upon it. Let him know then, that our Translators put in the Word, *Could*, without Reason, and without Authority; and that there is no Word to answer it in the Original Text. There is a Defect of the Verb, as there is, 2 Kings xiii. 19. where, *Thou shouldest*, is understood. In the other Text, all that is in the *Hebrew* is, *But not to drive out the Inhabitants of the Valley, &c.* How should we supply these Words? Should we do it in such a way as would make the sacred Author write *Blasphemy*? Should we not rather supply it so as to make him write consistently with all his other Discourse? Is it not most evident, that his Meaning was, that they *proceeded not*, or *would not attempt to drive out* the Inhabitants of the Vallies, because they would not trust in God, but indulged their own ungodly Fears of the Iron Chariots? They told these their Fears to *Joshua*, Josh. xvii. 16. Whereupon *Joshua* forbid their Fears, and told them they should drive out the *Canaanites*, *tho' they had Iron Chariots*, ver. 18. And this the sacred *Historian* justly supposes they might have done, if they would have laid aside their Cowardice, and have served, and trusted in the Almighty.

It is to be remark'd, that our Author, p. 258. expressly teaches, that God's Promise to *Abraham* of giving

giving his Posterity the Land of *Canaan* for an everlasting Possession, was not an absolute, but a *conditional Promise*, to be fulfil'd, *Provided his Posterity would continue in the Worship of the true God*. Was it not then perfectly *malicious* in him, but six Pages before, to represent this Promise as not fulfil'd till about 400 Years after the Accomplishment of it was to be expected, when he knew that during those 400 Years, between *Moses* and *David*, the *Jews* did not fulfil the Condition of inheriting the whole Land, but *forsook* God, and *broke* his Commandments? His Design in the 253d Page was to *banter* Revelation, and to shew, that the Promise was not fulfil'd, and therefore he here went upon the Supposition of its being *absolute*. But in p. 258. his Design was to condemn the *Jews*, as not understanding the Promise; and therefore here he contends that the Promise was only *conditional*. These things confirm an old Observation, *viz.* That they who would write History by Invention, have need of a very strong Memory. Now, according to our Author's own Confession, it appears, that the true Reason why the *Israelites* did not subdue all *Canaan* under *Joshua* was, because they did not perform the Condition upon which God promised them the Victory.

The Moral Philosopher seems to have a little Fit of *Modesty*, when he says, that *Samuel* seems to have looked upon the Devastation of his Country, not only with Indifference, but Pleasure; and that the Country was settled in Peace perhaps to the great Mortification of this Prophet, p. 296, 298. It is a wonder, that our Author had not, according to his Custom, positively asserted these Falsities. But the Habit soon returns; for he immediately says, *The Prophet doubtless intended to make a Sacrifice of Saul*; and that it is evident he laid a Plot for the Destruction of the King, when he order'd him to destroy all the *Amalekites*, and to give none of the Plunder to the Soldiers. And yet our Author cannot prove, that if *Saul* had not given the Soldiers the Plunder of the conquer'd Country,

Country, the whole Army would have deserted, or destroy'd him. For tho' this Philosopher positively says, *This is what they had never been denied in all their Wars*; yet, if ever he read the Bible, he knew this to be *false*. When the *Israelites* took *Jericho*, they utterly destroy'd all that was in the City, both Man and Woman, young and old, and Ox, and Sheep, and Ass, with the Edge of the Sword, Josh. vi. 21. And because *Achan* had taken some of the Plunder for his own Use, and had not destroy'd it, he was stoned to death, and yet the Soldiers did not mutiny or desert. It is needless to mention more Instances.

Our Philosopher says, p. 332. supposing the Prophets foretold the Birth, Life, Miracles, Crucifixion, and Resurrection of Christ (as it is manifest to every impartial Reader of them they did) still *this could not prove the Truth of any Doctrines, or the Righteousness of any Person.* Mahomet might have been foretold too. From which he infers, that *Prophecy is no rational Foundation of true Religion.* But here our Philosopher does not understand what he is writing about. He needs, it seems, to be informed, that we do not imagine, that a Person's being merely foretold is an Evidence, that he is a true Prophet of God. Suppose *Mahomet* had been as particularly described by the old Prophets as Christ was, then *Mahomet* would have been foretold as a *false* Prophet, whereas Christ was foretold as a *true* one. That is, the Prophets, from God, order'd, that when Christ should come, Men should *bear him in all Things whatsoever he should say*: Whereas if they had foretold *Mahomet*, they would have warn'd Men not to hearken to him or go after him. The Predictions of the Messiah pointed out the Person, by such Characters as would distinguish him from every other Man; and when, by means of the prophetic Description, he was found out, Men were obliged to believe in him, because God by his Prophets required them to do so. And that this Command came from God is plain, because
it

it was, as we may well call it, part of the Prediction. But the predicting the Messiah, in all the particular Circumstances mentioned in the Prophets, was infinitely above the Power of Man, and must be attributed to God himself. This Matter may be made very plain by a parallel Case : Suppose the King should send a Letter to the States of *Holland*, and therein say, ' A Month hence I will send an Ambassador to you : ' The Marks by which you may distinguish him from ' a Counterfeit, are such and such. I hear that another Person will come, pretending to be my Ambassador, to whom the forementioned Characters do ' not agree ; receive him not, but receive him whom ' I send, and believe him in all he reports from me ; ' for I know I can depend upon his Fidelity '. Thus the divine Predictions of the Messiah distinguish'd Jesus from all Pretenders, and are a most rational and divine Foundation of Faith in him.

The Philosopher talks, *p.* 343,--346. as if Miracles could be no Proof of Religion, and as if there could be no positive Institutions in it. Now it must be own'd, that if there are no Doctrines, Commands, or Promises in the Christian Religion, but what could be discovered by the Light of Nature, it would not be much amiss to say, that Miracles could be no Proof of Christianity. But since there are in the Christian Religion, Doctrines, Commands and Promises, which could not be discovered by the Light of Nature, Miracles may, and were necessary to, be a Proof of this Religion. There are *three* Kinds of Doctrine which it is possible Men may teach, *viz.* such as *Reason* can discover to be true ; such as *Reason* can discover to be *false* ; and such as *Reason* cannot discover at all. Those which Reason can discover to be true need no Miracles to prove their Truth. Accordingly Miracles were not wrought to prove, that the Sun gives us more Light and Heat than the Moon, or that God is to be loved above all.

Those

Those Doctrines which *Reason* can discover to be *false* cannot be proved to be true by any Miracles : consequently, that Miracles may not be useless, we may assure ourselves, that God will not permit such Men to work Miracles without Opposition, as teach Doctrines that are plainly contrary to Reason ; or, which is much the same, that he will not suffer such as work Miracles, without Opposition, to teach such false Doctrines. The Use of Miracles then must be to confirm the Truth of such Doctrines as our natural Reason cannot of itself discover to be either true or false : Such Doctrines cannot be proved to be true and divine in any other Way. The *Nature* of the Doctrine or Command can only shew, that as there is no Contradiction or Immorality in it, it is *capable* of being proved to be *divine* : But the Proof that it is *actually* divine arises *intirely* from *Miracles*. Suppose a Man should now arise, and call himself a Prophet, and teach us, as from God, that when we partake of the Lord's Super, we should sign ourselves with the Sign of the Cross, in token of our not being ashamed of the Cross of Christ. The mere Nature of this Command could not shew that it is not from God ; since there is nothing immoral or absurd in the *Nature* of it. The only Reason why we reject it as not a divine Command, is because it is not established by Miracles. Thus the mere *Nature* of Baptism and the Lord's Super doth not shew that they *are* divine Institutions ; but only that they are *capable* of being so, since there is nothing immoral, or absurd in their Nature. If they had not been established by Miracles, they could not have been known to be divine ; and the only Proof of their being divine Institutions arises from the Miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostles, who, in the Name of God, ordained these Institutions for the Christian Church. And that their Miracles were full Proof

of their divine Commission and Authority, I before proved. It must be added, that the divine Institutions of the Christian Religion are not insignificant Ceremonies, but every way worthy of a wise God. Baptism is a Mean of receiving Persons into the Christian Church: and the Lord's Supper is most obviously calculated and adapted to improve Men in Love to God and to one another. For we are there called to *remember* Christ, and to *show forth his Death*, as the Death of the Son of God, who gave himself for our Sins according to the Will of our God and Father. When we remember this, we must be stupid as Stocks if we do not learn from hence to love God above all, for providing such a Savior; to love Christ who loved us, and died for us; and to love all Mankind as Christ loved us.

One might easily answer many other ill-natur'd Reflexions on the holy Scripture in the Book I have been considering: But I am weary of raking into such impertinent Stuff as that Author has thrown together. Upon the whole, it is evident from what has been shewn in these Papers, that his Representations of Facts can never be depended upon; and that if any thing of Scripture, to which he refers, looks ridiculous, his Readers may assure themselves, that he has designedly misrepresented it. The Author of the Book I don't know, but from the Book itself it is evident, that that is his true Character, which he gives of *Sophronius*, p. 425, and which is so peculiarly like him, that one would think it was designed for himself, *viz. He has a Smattering of every thing, but understands nothing: He has a tolerable good Memory, a little Judgment, a great deal of Vanity, but NO HONESTY.*

F I N I S.

BOOKS printed for JOHN NOON, at the White
Hart, near Mercer's Chapel, Cheapſide.

I. **A** Free and impartial Study of the Holy Scriptures recommended: In three Vols. 8vo. Containing, Notes on many peculiar Texts of Scripture, and Diſcourſes on various Subjects, By JOSEPH HALLETT Junior.

II. The Principles of Moral Philoſophy. An Enquiry into the wiſe and good Government of the moral World. In which the Continuance of good Adminiſtration; and due Care about Virtue for ever, is inferr'd from preſent Order in all Things, in that part chiefly where Virtue is concerned. By GEORGE TURNBULL, LL. D.

III. Chriſtian Philoſophy: Or, the Chriſtian Doctrines concerning God, Providence, Virtue, and a Future State, proved to be agreeable to true Philoſophy, and to be attended with a truly Philoſophical Evidence. By GEORGE TURNBULL, LL. D.

IV. A Methodical Syſtem of Univerſal Law: Or, the Laws of Nature and Nations deduced from certain Principles, and applied to proper Caſes. Written in *Latin* by the celebrated *Jo. Got. Heineccius*, Counſellor of State to the King of *Prussia*, and Profeſſor of Philoſophy. Translated, and illuſtrated with Notes and Suppliments. By GEORGE TURNBULL, LL. D. To which is added, A Diſcourſe on the Nature and Origin of Moral and Civil Laws; in which they are deduced, by an Analyſis of the Human Mind in the experimental Way, from our internal Principles and Diſpoſitions. In 2 Vol.

V. A Diſſertation on the Civil Government of the Hebrews. In which the true Deſigns and Nature of their Government are explain'd. The Juſtice, Wiſdom and Goodneſs of the Moſaical Conſtitutions, are vindicated: In particular, from ſome late, unfair and falſe Representations of them in the Moral Philoſopher. With an APPENDIX, in which ſome Parts of that Government are further explain'd and vindicated, and ſome more unfair and falſe Representations of it by the Moral Philoſopher are detected. By MOSES LOWMAN.

VI. An Eſſay towards explaining the Hiſtory and Revelation of the Scripture in their ſeveral Periods. To which is added, a Diſſertation on the Fall of Man. By JEREMIAH HUNT, D. D. pr. 4s.

VII. A Tranſlation of Dr. *Whitby's* Latin Treatiſe of Original Sin; by *Heywood*. 4s.

VIII. *The fourth Edition, with very large Additions and Improvements, of The Negotiator's Magazine, or the moſt authentick Account yet published, of the Moneys, Weights, and Meaſures of the principal Places of Trade in the World; their Conformity to the Engliſh and Dutch Weights and Meaſures, and Variety of uſeful Remarks thereon. The Courſe of Exchange, plain and neceſſary Rules to caſt them up by, the Laws and Cuſtoms thereof, the Advantages to be made by them, and how; and the Nature and Uſe of ſimple and compound Arbitrations. To which,*
are

are added, Curious Calculations, of great Use in the West-India, Carolina, and New-England Trades; and Tables shewing the intrinsic Value of any foreign Gold or Silver Coin. All of great Use to Merchants and Traders, and entirely necessary to those who would understand Merchants Accompts. By Richard Hayes, PF. 63.

IX. *The Second Edition, with considerable Alterations and Additions, of A Practical Grammar of the Greek Tongue; wherein all the Rules are expressed in English; those necessary to be got by Heart, made the Text; others immediately subjoined in the form of Notes. The whole established upon rational Principles, supported by Classical Authorities, and considered, as to Method and Length, with all Convenience to the LEARNER.*

With a VOCABULARY of such Particulars as could not well be disposed into the Body of the Grammar. To which is added, a rational Scheme of RHETORIC. Price 6 s.

X. *In the Press and speedily will be published, the second Edition, of A practical Grammar of the Latin Tongue; in the same Method and Form, and by the same Author as the above Greek Grammar.*

XI. CYROPAEDIA: or, the Institution of CYRUS, concerning Religion and Government. Translated from the Greek Original of XENOPHON, by the late honourable MAURICE ASHLEY, Esq; (Brother to the late Earl of SHAFTSBURY.) Address'd to the Lady ELIZABETH HARRIS, in a Dissertation upon the true Liberty of thinking in Matters both Ecclesiastical and Civil. By the Translator. In two Vol. 8vo. Price 9 s.

XII. The History of the SEVARAMBIANS, a People of the South Continent: In five Parts. Containing an Account of the Government, Laws, Religion, Manners, and Language of that Nation. Translated from the Memoirs of Captain SIDEN, who liv'd near fifteen Years amongst them. Price 5 s.

XIII. A Treatise of Human Nature; being an Attempt to introduce the experimental Method of Reasoning into moral Subjects: Wherein the Nature of the Understanding and Passions is examined and explained. In 3 Volumes Octavo. Price 14 s.

XIV. The Philosophical Grammar; being a View of the present State of experimented Physiology, or Natural Philosophy. By B. MARTIN. The second Edition, with large Additions, Price 6 s.

XV. The young Student's Memorial Book; or Pocket Library of the Mathematicks. By B. MARTIN. Price 3 s.

XVI. A new and universal System, or Body of Decimal Arithmetick; containing its Doctrine, Application and Use, in all the Parts of Arithmetick, Mathematicks, &c. By B. MARTIN. Price 6 s.

XVII. The young Trigonometer's Complete Guide, being plain and spherical Trigonometry made plain and easy. By BENJAMIN MARTIN, Teacher of the Mathematicks, in 2 Vol. Octavo. Price 10 s.

XVIII. The Elements of all Geometry, By B. MARTIN. Price 6 s.

A *R. Flexman*
REBUKE
TO THE
Moral Philosopher
FOR THE
ERRORS and IMMORALITIES
Contained in his
Third Volume.



L O N D O N:

Printed for J. Noon, at the *White Hart* near
Mercers Chapel, Cheapside.

M.DCC.XL.

REFURB

TO THE

Moral Philosopher

FOR THE

ERRORS and IMORALITIES

Of the

Third Volume



L O N D O N :

Printed for J. Noon, at the White Hart, near
Museum Chapel, Chancery.

M.DCC.XI.



A
R E B U K E
TO THE
Moral Philosopher, &c.



AN excellent Divine has well observed, that *Overdoing is Undoing*. With the Writings of this Divine, our pretended *Moral Philosopher* is said to have been well acquainted heretofore. But alas! he has now forgot the salutary Caution. In this his *Third* Volume just now published, he has been frequently and surprisingly guilty of this *Overdoing*. He has carried Matters so far, and has advanced such palpable *Falshoods*, that it cannot but prejudice every wise Man against his whole Book, and utterly ruin his Cause. He has, tho' undesignedly, done an Honour to the Bible, by shewing, that it must first be misrepresented, before it can be ridiculed. Of this I shall here give several very plain Instances.

After our Author had honestly mention'd *Joseph's* Virtue in refusing the amorous Solicitations of his Mistress, p. 6. He adds, 'Whether *Joseph*, during his Confinement in the King's Prison, and the great Power and Trust there committed to him, had not made

‘ *up the Matter* with his old *Mistress*, is not said; and
 ‘ I shall presume to determine nothing about it’, *p. 9.*
 Such a vile, unproved, unprovable Insinuation against
 any *Friend* of our Author’s, would be condemned as
immoral and inhuman.

Our great Philosopher teaches, *p. 12.* That it is
 evident from the History in *Genesis*, ‘ That *Pharaoh*
 ‘ had *divested* himself of *all* *regal* Authority, and re-
 ‘ tain’d only the *Name* and *Title.*’ Whereas every
 one else knows, that when *Pharaoh* said, *Only in, or,*
on the Throne will I be greater than thou, he reserved
 to himself *supreme* Dominion, and kept it in his own
 Power to *controul, or degrade, and change* his Prime-
 Minister whenever he pleas’d. Our Philosopher, I
 find, understands Politics, just as he does Theology.

With a grave Air, as if he was really a *Moral* Phi-
 losopher, he tells us, that ‘ *Joseph* was order’d to make
 ‘ his Brethren *Governors, and Rulers* in *Egypt*; and
 ‘ that they were in Possession of the *chief* Places of
 ‘ *Power and Profit* in the Kingdom’, *p. 16, 24.* The
 Truth is, that *Pharaoh* order’d *Joseph*, if he knew any
 Men of Activity among his Brethren, he should make
 them *Rulers over Pharaoh’s Cattle*, *Gen. xlvii.* Admi-
 rable Skill in State-Affairs! Our Philosopher, it seems,
 has a *new* Notion, which no other Person had ever
 Sagacity enough to discover, *viz.* That they who are
 only appointed to rule over a King’s *Cattle*, are *ipso*
facto, by that Appointment, constituted Lord Chan-
 cellors, Lord Lieutenants, Field-Mmarshals, &c. Here
 is either great Weakness, or gross Immorality.

In the next place, I must beg leave to set our Au-
 thor right in an Affair wherein he has been misled
 both by *Jews* and *Christians*. He charges *Joseph* with
 ‘ removing the People from their former Habitations
 ‘ into the remotest Cities and parts of the Country,
 ‘ from one Side of *Egypt* to the other: Which (saith
 ‘ he) was a Sort of *Exile* in their own Country, and
 ‘ a great Aggravation of their Misery,’ *Gen. xlvii.*
p. 18. This Charge, which has often been advanced
 against

against *Joseph*, is intirely without any solid Foundation. The present *Hebrew* Text, as it is well render'd by our *English* Translators, is, *As for the People, he removed them TO Cities, from one End of the Borders of Egypt, even to the other End thereof.* Now it is certain, that even in this Reading and Version, there is not one Word said of removing the People FROM one City to another; but only of removing them TO Cities, throughout all the Land. It is not said, that he removed them out of one end of the Land into the other end of it; but only that this removing them TO Cities was *universal*, not in one end of the Land only, but from End to End, or, in *all* Parts of the Land. This is all the meaning that the present Text will bear. But it cannot be supposed that this was in Fact the Case: It cannot be thought, that *Joseph* removed all the Country-People from their Farms and Cottages into Cities: Since then none would have been left upon the Lands to manure them for the Service of *Pharaoh*. All this Difficulty is owing to an Error of the *Jewish* Transcribers of the *Hebrew* Copies. The true and primitive Reading of the Text is preserved in the *Samaritan* Copy of it, and in the *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Samaritan* Versions, viz. *As for the People, he subjected them for Servants, from one End of the Borders of Egypt, unto the other End thereof.* Agreeably to this the People say, v. 25. *We will be Pharaoh's Servants.* They voluntarily, and of their own accord offer'd themselves to be his Servants, v. 19. But here was nothing like an *Exile*; they were permitted to remain on the same Lands they occupied before. Neither was their *Service* so very hard as some have thought. They were only bound to give *Pharaoh* yearly a Fifth Part of the *Bread-Corn*, which the Lands should produce; while *all the other* Productions were intirely their own. The Words of *Moses* are, *Joseph said unto the People, Behold, I have bought you this Day, and your Land for Pharaoh: Lo, here is Seed for you, and ye shall sow the Land: and it shall come to pass in the increase,*

crease, that you shall give the Fifth part unto Pharaoh; and four parts shall be your own, for Seed of the Field, and for your Food.—And Joseph made it a Law over the Land of Egypt unto this Day, that Pharaoh should have the Fifth Part; Gen. xlviii. 23, 24, 26. As the Occasion of this Law related only to Bread-Corn, and nothing else is mentioned in the Text, it is necessary to conclude, that the Egyptians were not obliged, by virtue of this Law, to give the King the Fifth Part of any other Product.

Our Philosopher shews, that he has no great Faculty of solving *Phænomena* of Nature, when he makes Joseph's Craft, to be the Cause of the seven Years Famine in Egypt. His new Manner of accounting for it is this. ' In the sixth Year of the Famine, ' besides the Corn which was absolutely necessary to ' preserve Life, Joseph gave them Seed-Corn to sow ' the Land.—Here we are let into the Secret, how the ' Famine in Egypt come to last so long, and by what ' Means the Hebrew Prophet and Landlord was enabled to fulfil his own Predictions. For having at ' first ingrossed and monopolized all the Corn, he was ' resolved for such a Time, to give out no more of ' it, than what might be just necessary to support Life ' from Hand to Mouth, but to let the Egyptians have ' no Corn for Seed, till he had strip'd them of all their ' Property,' p. 19, 20. If our Philosopher here believes himself, he must be excessively weak. Did not Joseph, in every Year of the Famine actually sell Corn to the Egyptians, and to People of other Countries too? And was there not in fact enough left in the last Year of the Famine both for Bread and for Seed? Might they not then in any one of the seven Years have bought enough for Seed, if they had had an Opportunity for sowing? What was wanted for Seed was very little, in proportion to what was expended in Bread for a Year. And therefore it must have been very easy for a Family, when it was buying Corn, to buy a little more than would be necessary

sary for present Subsistence, and sow it in the Earth. Or, at worst, a Family out of the *many* Bushels required to maintain them, might well enough save a Bushel or two for *Seed*, had the Ground been capable of receiving Seed, and of bringing forth Fruit. No one, that understands human Nature can imagine, that it was possible for *Joseph*, with all his Art and Authority, to hinder a *whole Nation* from sowing their Grounds for six Years together, if they had any manner of Apprehension, that the Earth would bring forth Fruit. The Nation, and even his Guards themselves, would have rose as one Man, and have torn the tyrannical *Foreigner* in Pieces. Our *wise* Philosopher, it seems, wants to be taught, that *Egypt* is made fruitful by the overflowing of the *Nile*, and that if, in any Year it did not rise above twelve Cubits, a Famine ensued. This undoubtedly was the real Oecasion of the Famine in the Days of *Joseph*. That it was caused by *Joseph* is a Thing too ridiculous to be said by any one, but Dr. Mor--al Philosopher.

He often insists upon it, that *Jaakob* (as he chooses to call *Jacob*; tho' if he would be so over critical, he should have said, *Jaaquob*; since the *Hebrew*, *Quoph* answers not to our K, but to our Q.) *worshipped an Angel*, when he said, *The Angel, that hath deliver'd me from all evils, bless the Children*, Gen. xlviii. 16. p. 87, 105. But it is easy to see, that this Charge has not the least Foundation to support it. It is no way necessary (to say the least) to understand this Expression as an Instance of *Worship*, or as a *direct Address* to any Person. Supposing I should stand by our Author, and hear him say to a Friend going a Voyage, *May the Winds favor you!* Supposing, I should hereupon accuse our Author of *worshipping the Winds*: Would he not readily justify himself by saying, *It was no Prayer, but only a Wish?* On the very same Grounds he must own, that *Jacob* did not *pray* to an Angel, (but if there was any Angel in the Case) only *wish'd*, that the Children might be under his Protection. But the Truth is,
that

that *Jacob* did not speak of an *Angel* at all. For the true Reading of the Text is that which is preserved in that invaluable Treasure, the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, both in the Text and Version, viz. *The King, that redeemed me from all evil, bless the Lads.* Compare *Numb. xxiii. 21.* Either way, here is not the *Appearance* of Angel-Worship.

I can hardly prevail on myself to transcribe the *Nasty Remark* he makes, p. 174. in the following Words, viz. ‘ Perhaps one Reason why the *Egyptian* Sorcerers could not create *Lice*, might be, because they had none about them, and the *Israelites* were better stock’d.’ This will sooner *nauseate* his Reader’s Stomachs, than enter into their Heads. They will more *contemn* the Author, than admit his Solution. For *ALL the Dust of the Land became Lice.*

In the same Page he saith, ‘ What gives one the stronger Suspicion of *Confederacy* in this Case is, that *Moses* could never work any of these Wonders alone, or without the Presence and Assistance of *Aaron*; for when *Moses* gave the Word of Command, *Aaron* still was to stretch out the Rod, or wave the Wand, and then the thing was done by a *Hocus-pocus Legerdemain.*’ Our Author has here undertaken a very hard Task indeed, when he would account for all the Miracles of *Moses* in *Egypt* by *Legerdemain.* He had acted more politicly, and had talk’d more like a Philosopher, if he had *denied*, or *allegorized* away the whole Story. But to admit the *Truth* of the Facts, and then to go about to *account* for them by a mere *Confederacy* of *two* Men, is excessively weak. What could *two* Men do more than one, toward inflicting the Ten Plagues on *Egypt*? As *Moses* alone could not turn *all the Water* in *Egypt* into Blood, or even give it a red Tincture: So this could no more be effected by the *Confederacy* of *two* Brothers. What could *Aaron*’s waving his Wand do toward causing Frogs to get into *Pharaoh*’s Bed-Chamber, and upon his Bed, upon *all the Land*, and *all the People*, more than *Moses* his bare

bare Word of Command could do? Tell us, O Philosopher, How could *two* Men by *Hocus-pocus* Legerdemain bring down *Hail*, and Lightning from Heaven, or cause a thick Darkness thro' a whole large Kingdom for three Days together? Verily, if this great Philosopher, with the Assistance of one, or even *ten* of his Brethren, will do such things, we will immediately believe in him, and become his Followers. His Method of accounting for these Things in a natural Way, is infinitely more improbable and repugnant to Reason than he can imagine those Miracles to be. But Unbelievers are very *credulous*.

Another Instance of monstrous *Credulity* is our Author's supposing, that 'The *Strength* of Faith, or natural Power of *Imagination*, might be the principal Cause of such extraordinary Cures,' as were performed by *Christ*. His learned and ingenious Adversary answer'd (among many other things, which the Philosopher has intirely slipt over) that a *personal* Faith was not always necessary to the Cure. Could the *Centurion's* Faith heal his dying Servant? Or could the Ruler's Faith heal his Son, and that in an *Instant*, and at a *Distance*? To these Queries our Author is forced to answer, *No*. 'But (adds he with a grave Air, as if he believed it) the Servant and the Son knowing where the Prophet then was, and at what Time the Master and the Father would come up and speak with him; and being firmly and invincibly perswaded, that as soon as *Jesus* could be spoke with they should be healed; their Faith and Imagination, tho' at a Distance, might work as strongly, and have the same Effect, as if they had been personally present at the same Time,' p. 200. Verily the Imagination of his Readers must work as strongly, or else they will never be able to believe his Solution of this Matter. It would be well for our Author, if his Power of Imagination was weaker, and he had a great deal more of Reason in his Composition. I may add, that if such Cures had been effected

in an *Instant* and at a Distance, by the *Faith* and *Imagination* of the Patients, this would have been as great a Miracle, as our Saviour's performing them by a *Word*. So that our Author's Solution will stand him in no stead.

Our Author thinks he has occasion to glory and triumph, when he says, that *Jesus* ' could work none of ' those uncontestable Miracles at *Nazareth*, in his own ' Family, and among his Neighbours and Acquaintance,' p. 204. He refers, no doubt, to *Mark* vi. 5. where we read, *Jesus could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his Hands upon a few sick Folk, and healed them.* St. *Matthew* speaking of the same thing, says, *He did not many mighty Works there, because of their Unbelief*, Chap. xiii. 58. Upon comparing these original Accounts with what our Author says, Charity itself will hardly deem him to be worthy the Title of a *Moral* Philosopher. He says, *Christ* could there work *None* of these Miracles. But the Evangelists, to whom he refers, and from whom alone he has the Story, say, he did *not many*, none but *healing a few* sick People. If our Philosopher does not know the Difference between *A Few*, and *None*, I will acknowledge, that he has not wilfully misrepresented the Fact. It is plain from St. *Mark's* Account, that, whatever the Number was of sick Folks upon whom *Christ* there laid his Hands, he healed *them all*. Our Author, I perceive, is not aware of the *Reason*, why *Christ* could do no more such Cures at *Nazareth*. It was not for want of *Power* in him, but merely for want of *Opportunity*. At other Places People brought to him *all that were sick*, and he every where *healed them all*, *Matth.* iv. 24. xii. 15. *Luke* iv. 40. vi. 17, 18, 19. *Matth.* xiv. 35, 36. xix. 2. But at *Nazareth* the generality of the People had not Faith enough in them to imagine that *Jesus* could miraculously heal their Sick, and therefore *they would not bring them* to him at all, they would not give him an *Opportunity* of shewing his miraculous Power.

At *Nazareth*, as well as at other Places, *Christ* healed all that were brought to him. At other places *Many* were brought, and those *Many* were healed. But at *Nazareth* a *few* only were brought, and this is the real, and only Reason why he there *heal'd* only a *few*. There he would have heal'd more, if the Unbelief of the People had not hindered them from making Application to him.

Notwithstanding our Author's Pretenses to Sagacity and Skill above other Men, he has happened to discover a very odd *Absence* of Thought. A Matter that is as clear as the Light to every one else, is, it seems, extremely *dark* to our great Philosopher! Having quoted a Passage from Dr. *Leland*, he says, p. 225. ' There is one Expression in this Paragraph, which ' seems to me as *dark*, as the rest are bright. He ' says, I must suppose *these Nations* to be as senseless, ' as I make the *Israelites* to be, if I imagine, that such ' Stuff as this can pass upon them. But who were ' *these Nations* ? Were there any other Nations besides the *Israelites*, who were witness to the Truth, ' and Reality of this, or any other of *Moses's* Miracles in the Wilderness ? I suppose the Author might ' want such Witnesses ; but not finding them upon ' Earth, he was forced to fetch them from the Moon.' What poor, wretched Trifling is this ? Behold, the Man that calls himself a *Philosopher*, ignorantly imagines, that THESE Nations *now* in Being, are THOSE Nations that *were* subsisting, while the *Israelites* were in the Wilderness ! Who would have thought that so very ingenious a Philosopher should need to be told that *These Nations* of which Dr. *Leland* speaks, are no farther off than *Great-Britain* and *Ireland* ? Dr. *Leland* lives in the one of them ; and our wise Philosopher in the other. *These* are the Nations upon which Dr. *Leland* thought our Philosopher endeavours to make such Stuff as his Misrepresentations are, to pass. And how he could miss this plain, obvious Sense of the Doctor's Expression, I cannot conceive. Let his *Ad-*

shirers say. And let him next consider a little before he writes. Here I do not suspect any Immorality. It was only a Fit of *Weakness*.

But the next Passage I shall quote from him is grossly and shockingly *Immoral*. 'Tho' *Samuel* (says he, p. 307.) was not the right Heir, yet he might be nearer *allyed* to the High-Priesthood than this Writer imagines. The Historian lets us know, that *Samuel's Mother* could never have a Child by her Husband, nor breed at all, 'till she went up, and made her Case known, and told her Distress for a Child to the Priests who then stood before the Lord. We are also assured, that *Eli's Son* lay with the Women, who came with their Gifts and Offerings to the Sanctuary.' Is not this a most *vile* Insinuation? Is not this an *outrageous* Charge of *Adultery* upon a virtuous, innocent Woman, whose Character was never sullied? Suppose any near and valued Relation of our Author's had been married many Years without being pregnant, and then had taken a Journey to *Bath*, where Men as bad as *Eli's Sons* have sometimes been, and afterward had a Son; would our Author bear, that such a scandalous Reflection should be cast upon her? Would he not loudly complain of Injustice, Inhumanity, Barbarity, Slander? His own Conscience tells him, that he can no more *prove* the Charge against *Samuel's Mother*. If he had the least Regard to *Morality*, he would not do to others, what he would not have done to a *Relation* of his.

Our Author had been justly told, that *Moses* was far from any worldly *ambitious* Views, since, tho' he left *two Sons*, he did not *raise* either of them, or their Children, to any *Dignity* at all, but left them to continue undistinguish'd among the common *Levites*. This the Philosopher pronounces *A mere Fiction*, and then adds, p. 333, 'That *Moses* had two Sons living, or any Issue or Descendant from them, when he died, is *not said*.' And yet *it is expressly said* in more

more Places than one in the Old Testament. So long after the Death of *Moses*, as the Reign of *David* and *Solomon*, there were in fact Descendants from *Gershom*, and *Eliezer*, the two Sons of *Moses*. The Words of the sacred Author are, ‘ Now the *Levites* were number’d ; . The Sons of *Amram*, *Aaron*, and *Moses*.— ‘ Now concerning *Moses* the *Man of God*, his Sons were named of the Tribe of *Levi*. The Sons of ‘ *Moses* were *Gershom*, and *Eliezer*. Of the Sons of ‘ *Gershom*, *Shebuel* was the Chief. And the Sons of ‘ *Eliezer*, *Rehabiah* the Chief. And *Eliezer* had none ‘ other Sons ; but the Sons of *Rehabiah* were *very many* ‘ [in the Days of *David*]. 1 *Chron.* xxiii. 3, 13—17. ‘ And *Shebuel* the Son of *Gershom*, the Son of *Moses*, ‘ was Ruler of the Treasures. And his Brethren by ‘ *Eliezer*, *Rehabiah* his Son, and *Jeshaiab* his Son, and ‘ *Joram* his Son, and *Zickri* his Son, and *Shelomith* ‘ his Son ; which *Shelomith* and his Brethren were over ‘ all the Treasures of the dedicate Things which ‘ *David*, &c. dedicated.—It was under the Hand of ‘ *Shelomith*, and of his Brethren, xxvi. 24—28.’ The Question now is, Whether we shall believe our own Eyes, or this Philosopher ? With our own Eyes we see, it is said, that *Moses* had Issue when he died, and even home to the Days of *David* at least ; and yet our sagacious Philosopher adventures to deny this, and would fain persuade us, that no such Thing is said. This is another Demonstration, that he is not to be believed in any one thing he says.

One Error naturally begets another. Hence after our Author had said in the last cited Page, ‘ That ‘ *Moses* had two Sons living—when he died, is not ‘ said ; he adds, and the contrary is exceeding probable, and almost certain from the Story itself.’ But, as we have seen, that it is not only probable, not only almost certain, but absolutely certain, that he had Posterity at, and after his Death, our Author’s reasoning from Probability comes too late. Yet let us hear his

his Probabilities. He says, p. 334, that ‘*Moses parted with his Wife, while in Egypt, and that this was a Divorce.*’ Yet our Author is forced to own, that ‘*She with her Father, and her two Sons came to pay Moses a Visit soon after his Arrival in the Wilderness.*’ This is wonderfully ingenious! Our Philosopher has *Credulity* enough to believe, that tho’ *Moses*, as he says, *disclaim’d* his Wife, and her Children, and divorced her, yet they would travel into a *Wilderness* to pay him a Visit, and he civilly entertain them. I suppose very few Women would be of such a forgiving and humble Temper. Our Author adds, ‘*Yet after a short Stay, They went back again.*’ If you ask the Philosopher’s *Proof*, he has *none*. He has just now *invented* the History himself. It is very true, that *Jethro*, the Father-in-law of *Moses*, *return’d* to *Midian*; but we never read, that either his Daughter, or her Children, *return’d* with him. *Moses* is careful to tell us, That *THEY* came into the Wilderness with *Jethro*; but when he mentions *his* Return, he does not say, that *THEY* *return’d* with him. The Words are, *Moses let his Father-in-law depart; and HE went his way into his own Land*, *Exod. xviii. 27. Numb. x. 30, 31.* But our sagacious Author cannot distinguish between *He* and *They*!

About forty Years after this, *Moses* made War upon the *Midianites*, and destroy’d them; at which Time (says our Author, p. 335.) ‘*his Wife must have perished with her Children.*’ But this is a mere *Panick* of our Author’s. He has not proved that *They* *return’d* to *Midian*; and the Scripture has expressly assured us, that their Posterity reach’d down to the Days of *David*. Our Author, it seems, is resolved to *blacken Moses*. And since he cannot get help from History, he will *make* a History himself; as the Manner of other Infidels also is.

From what has been now said in these Papers it appears, that the Man, who calls Himself, *The Moral Philosopher*,

Philosopher, makes no Conscience of what he writes. He denies *certain* Facts, and *forges* History. This is the Method he takes to destroy the Credit of the Bible. But he misses his Aim; it only destroys the Credit of his own Book. It turns out vastly to the Honour of our holy Religion, that it cannot be attack'd in any other Way than this of Misrepresentation, and Falshood. Every *Truth* tallies with it. Truth will stand; and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.

F I N I S.

6 JU 65



BOOKS Printed for JOHN NEON,
White-Hart near Mercers Chapel, Cheap-side.

I. **T**HE Immorality of the moral Philosopher and its Vindication; being Answers to a Book, intitled, *The Moral Philosopher*. Price 1 s. 6 d.

II. *The Consistent Christian*: Being a Confutation of the Errors advanc'd in Mr. *Chubb's* late Book, intitled, *The true Gospel of Jesus Christ* asserted; relating to the Necessity of Faith, the Nature of the Gospel, the Inspiration of the Apostles, &c. With Remarks on his Dissertation on Providence. Price 6 d.

III. A Defence of a Discourse on the Impossibility of proving a Future State by the Light of Nature. With an Answer to the Rev. Mr. *Groves's* Thoughts on the same Subject. Price 1 s. 6 d.

IV. An Essay on the Use of Miracles. Design'd against the Assertion, That they are no proper Proof of a Divine Mission. To which is prefix'd, An Answer to some other Objections against Reveal'd Religion, contain'd in a late Book, intitled, *Christianity as old as the Creation*. Price 1 s.

V. *The Christian Creed*, concerning the Son of God as profess'd by those Christians, who are (falsely) call'd *Arians*. Price 1 d.

VI. The Truth and Importance of the Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation demonstrated, in a Defence of the late learned Mr. *Peirce's* thirteen Queries, and a Reply to Dr. *W——*, and a Gentleman's Answers to them; together with a full Confutation of Dr. *Waterland's* late Book of the Importance, &c. Pr. 1 s.

VII. *The Reconciler*: or, An Essay to shew that Christians are much more agreed in their Notions concerning the Holy Trinity than has been commonly represented. With a Reply to Mr. *Ball's* (of *Hamton*) Answer to some common Objections. Price 6 d.

VIII. Index Librorum MSS. Græcorum & Versionum Antiquarum Novi Fœderis viri Eruditissimi *J. Millius*, & *L. Kusterus*, cum tertia Editione *Stephanica* contulerunt. Price 1 s.

IX. A Letter to the Rev. Mr. *Entj*, being a Defence of several Notes and Discourses contain'd in a Book, intitled, *A free and impartial Study of the Scriptures recommended*. Price 6 d.

X. An Answer to Mr. *Mudge's* Sermon, intitled, *Liberty*. Price 6 d. The above Ten by Mr. *Joseph Hallett*, Jun.

XI. *Jesus Christ* the Mediator between God and Man, an Advocate for us with the Father, and a Propitiation for the Sin of the World. Price 2 s.

XII. A calm Enquiry, whether we have any Warrant from Scripture for addressing ourselves in a Way of Prayer or Praise directly to the Holy Spirit. Humbly offer'd to the Consideration of all Christians, particularly of Protestant Dissenters. To which is prefix'd, A Preface to the Rev. Mr. *Barker of Hackney*. By *Martin*. Price 6 d.

